

THE
CHRISTIAN
REMEMBRANCER.

No. 34.]

OCTOBER, 1821.

[VOL. III.]

ON RELIGIOUS SERIOUSNESS.

IF it be true, that we can have no reasonable hope of success in any thing that we undertake, unless we call into our aid all the powers of our body and mind; I mean, unless we are seriously impressed with the importance of what we have in hand, and attentive to the directions of those, who from their profession or experience, are likely to know better than ourselves, and fully purposed moreover to comply strictly with what they shall advise; and if the degree of this impression and consequent attention and compliance on our part is always found to be proportioned to the importance of what we have in view, we must be either very careless, or very inconsistent in our conduct, if we can hear the subject of religion proposed to our consideration without the liveliest interest and most profound attention. For religion is confessedly the most important of all things, since it is able to make us wise, and good, and happy: and that in a way which nothing else can; because religion is alone independent of external circumstances. A man may be rich to day, but he may not be so to-morrow; he may be in health now, and the next moment in his grave; he may be the envy of all in the morning, and in the evening their pity or their scorn. But religion never faileth. It accompanies us to our grave, yea, rather beyond the grave, into the blissful regions of immortality. It is our anchor on

earth, and our companion to heaven. We can do without all other things, I mean, all the immoderate pleasures and superfluities of life, all that the world thinks so highly of, and fancies to be so necessary; but we can never do without religion. We may go on for a time, deceiving others, and even deceiving ourselves; but ask the worldly-minded, the dissolute, and the unbeliever, in his last moments, if sickness (as is but too often the case,) hath not too much deadened, enervated, and distracted his powers, to suffer him to think at all, ask him then, what is really worth having? what is the one thing needful? Will he say, Riches? they will soon be no longer his:—Health? it is gone, death is at the door:—Infidelity? the word is bitterness to his soul, it is agony and despair. Religion, will be his answer; and, as the dreadful conviction flashes across his mind, what would he not then give to have secured for himself by a life of habitual faith and obedience, its support and solace at the hour of his departure.

Consider religion in itself—look to what it has revealed, and see how adapted it is in all its parts to the wants and capacities of man! how full in its commands! how rich, how abundantly rich in its promises! It is religion, or more scripturally speaking, the faith or the Gospel of Christ, which has laid open, (as far as our present experience and finite reason could be supposed, or was required to comprehend,) the nature

of God, and the end of man; the spirituality, the wisdom, and power, and goodness, and mysterious existence of the former in three united Persons, and the great and glorious objects for which the latter was created,—not, as many by their conduct seem to think, to live for ourselves alone, for the pleasures of sense, for the pursuit of wealth, and honour, and fame, or for the mere propagation of our species, but to do good to others, to their souls and bodies; to improve the talents, whether intellectual or moral, which it has pleased our heavenly Father to give us; to look on this world as a place, and this life only as a time, of trial—the one, a theatre on which we are to exhibit in all their attraction the graces of the Christian—the other, a season, in which we are to sow the good seed, that springeth up unto an everlasting life; and thus in the full conviction that we are but strangers and pilgrims on earth, to pass the time of our sojourning here in fear, in working out our own salvation, and providing heirs, like ourselves, of a blessed eternity. Such are the glorious truths, that religion reveals, teaching us moreover by the most perfect laws, and the surest and most appropriate promises of consolation and strength, that “denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world, looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour,—Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and “purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works, and meet to be partakers through his blood of the inheritance of the saints in light.”

How can it be, that any man of the commonest reflection, can hear such a subject as this proposed to his consideration—a subject so great, so glorious, so blessed—without feeling at the time, and conti-

ning to feel ever after, the utmost seriousness and concern about it? “The first requisite in religion,” says Archdeacon Paley,—(I quote from his Sermons, which with a few exceptions, are invaluable for their matter and manner)—“the first requisite in religion is seriousness. I can have no hope at all,” he continues, “of a man who does not find himself serious in religious matters, serious at the heart. If the judgment of Almighty God at the last day, if the difference between being saved and being lost, being accepted in the Beloved, and being cast forth into outer darkness, being bid by a tremendous word either to enter into the joy of the Father, or go into the fire prepared for the devil and his angels, for all who have served him and not God,—if these things do not make us serious, then it is most certain, either that we do not believe them, or that we have not yet thought of them at all, or that we have positively broken off thinking of them, have turned away from the subject, have refused to let it enter, have shut our minds against it; or lastly, that such a levity of mind is our character, as nothing whatever can make a serious impression upon.” It would be well for every one of my readers, if they would suffer these words of the Archdeacon to have their full effect on their minds. And here let me not be misunderstood. I am far, very far, from wishing to inculcate any thing like a severe, or gloomy, or melancholy spirit. Religious persons, on the contrary, if we make allowance for any peculiarity of constitution that this or that individual may have, are generally cheerful: they have indeed the most reason to be so, since their conscience sits light within them, and they have always something beyond this world to look to for support. The religion of Christ is in itself a cheerful religion,—it is a social religion.—Its divine Author was ever seen walking about among the sons of

men—dispensing happiness to all around him—now partaking of the hospitality of the publican, now gracing the marriage feast in Cana of Galilee. The pleasures which may innocently and abundantly be derived from a variety of worldly sources, are in truth but as so many flowers, with which God has been pleased to strew our path, to beguile the tediousness of our earthly pilgrimage; and the Christian's duty lies not in abstaining altogether from their use, but in learning their proper use; agreeably to the admonition of the Apostle, “using the world, as not abusing it,”—and in thus using it, we may be assured that we best comply with the wishes of Him who both made it, and placed us in it. All that I am anxious to enforce—and I am sure that this is perfectly compatible with a light heart, and a glad countenance, and a sober, moderate, and innocent enjoyment of the things of this world at other times, is such a disposition of mind, as makes us approach the subject of religion with feelings of reverence, as being the most solemn thing that can engage the attention of a rational creature; and with feelings of thankfulness also, that a subject containing truths so great and blessed, and essential to our happiness, should ever have been revealed to us—such a disposition, I mean, as inclines us to listen to its instructions with the deepest attention, receive its commands with a full purpose of obeying them, and treasure up its promises to be our stay and comfort here, and the ground of our everlasting enjoyment hereafter—for “they on the good ground” assuredly “are they, who in” a serious, as well as “an honest and good heart, having heard the word, keep it, and bring forth fruit with patience.”

C.

SCRIPTURE CRITICISM.

ON EPHESIANS iv. 10.

“He, that descended is the same also, that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things.”

THERE is in these words of the Apostle a twofold allusion, which renders them peculiarly valuable. The Apostle had just quoted that remarkable prophecy of the Psalmist, wherein speaking of the Messiah, he saith, “When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men.” And struck with the peculiarity of the expression, and the splendour of the image, and the quality of the Person, that formed the subject of the prophecy, he proceeds to argue in a manner, that on any other supposition were altogether inconclusive, and which is evidently thrown in but parenthetically, as if out of the overflowings of a devout soul, full of the dignity of his subject, and supplying from the redundancy of his own faith, what the words strictly speaking, would scarcely warrant.

Now that *He* ascended, what is it, if we consider the magnificent apparatus of types and prophecies, that announced his coming, and the wonders of his birth, and all his mighty works, and the fullness and authority of his preaching, and the purity of his life, and the healing efficacy of his death, and the glory of his resurrection, and the testimonies that were borne to his divinity by others, and the manner in which he spoke of himself and his relation to the Father, “what is it, but that *He* descended first unto the lower parts of the earth?” He, that we know, and David knew, and the Baptist declared to be “above all,” can only have come from above; for “he that is of the earth is earthy, and speaketh of the earth,” and not as this great and glorious Being spake, whilst he was amongst us. And therefore when we talk

of our Lord's ascension into heaven, we cannot but think on "the glory that he had with the Father before the world was," and of which for our sakes he voluntarily emptied himself, when he descended from thence. His exaltation to heaven is but his return unto his own, agreeably to those words of his, that "no man hath ascended up into heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man, which is in heaven;" so that in our Lord's case, there is a close connection between his ascent and descent—we may reason from the one to the other. "If he has ascended, what is it but that he descended first"—and farther, he that descended and took our flesh in the womb of the blessed Virgin, and became very and perfect man, is the same divine and ever-blessed Being, that with this very flesh thus assumed unto the divine nature, did "ascend up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things."

Taken in this sense, the words of the Apostle are plain and forcible, and form a brief, but complete summary of a Christian's faith—a short creed or profession easily laid up in our memories, of all that we are to believe respecting our ever-blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

C.

To the Editor of the Remembrancer.

Sir,

THROUGH the medium of your valuable publication, I beg permission to notice a circumstance which appears to me to demand explanation on the part of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

I refer to the French translation of the Bible published by that Society, and pronounced in the title-page, to have been "carefully revised and corrected according to the Hebrew and Greek texts."

Sanctioned by the authority of a Society, a numerous part of which avow their attachment to the Church of England, and see not the danger of a union with Dissenters of all denominations, the French translation was referred to by me, for the purpose of quoting texts in proof of the divine nature of Jesus Christ.

My surprize was great, when I met with a passage of the utmost importance to my purpose.

In our authorized English translation, the 18th and 19th verses of 2 Cor. v. stand thus:

"And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, *that God was in Christ*, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation."

In the French translation of the Bible Society, we read thus:

"18. Et tout cela vient de Dieu, qui nous a reconciliés avec lui par Jésus-Christ, et qui nous a confié le ministère de cette réconciliation. 19. Car Dieu a réconcilié le monde avec soi-même, par Christ, en n'imputant point aux hommes leur péchés; et il a mis en nous la parole de la réconciliation."

This is pronounced, as I have observed, to have been "carefully revised and corrected from the Hebrew and Greek text."

At this distance from England, I have but few books for reference, and can only compare this "revised and corrected" version, with the passage in the Greek Testament of Mill.

"Τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῇ καταλλάξεσσι ἡμῶν ἑαυτῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ δόντος ἡμῖν τῆς διακονίας τῆς καταλλαγῆς. Ὡς ὅτι Θεὸς πνεν Χριστῷ, ἡμεῖς κατὰ λασσιν ἑαυτῶν, μὴ λογιζομένους αὐτοὺς τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν καὶ διμενος ἐν ἡμῖν τοι λόγοι τῆς καταλλαγῆς."

The Bible Society's French translation is said to be printed from the

Paris edition of the year 1805, and was doubtless purposely selected by the Society, in preference to other editions, notwithstanding it is well known that the French Protestants consider the best French version of the Bible to be that of Martin, in which the words, "Ὡς οὗτις Θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ, κόσμον καὶ πλάσσω ἐν αὐτῷ," "To wit, that God was in Christ," &c. are literally translated, "*Car Dieu étoit en Christ, réconciliant le monde avec lui-même.*"

At a time, when Socinianism is supposed to be making rapid strides through the ranks of the self-conceited and superficially learned, is it not incumbent upon members of the Church of England, who compose part of a Society, by whose authority a corrupted translation of the Bible is sent forth into the world, to consider the awful responsibility which they have incurred, and the evil consequences of their being thus instrumental in the circulation of error?

The boast of the Bible Society has been, that they circulate the authorized Translation of the Bible. Let them look well to the "revision and correction" of their foreign versions. I trust they will, at all events, give their attention to the passage which is the subject of my present observations.

L.

Caen, August 1, 1821.

ON MAN'S CORRUPT STATE BY NATURE.

(Continued from page 522.)

To the Editor of the Remembrancer.

Sir,

By the use which C. P. has made of the parable of the sower, he has obliged me to retort against himself the charge, which he has brought against me, of assuming what he is bound to prove. There is the same want of conclusiveness in this as in

the case of the righteousness of the Patriarchs. It is not enough that the ground is good, but if the argument is to be decisive, it must be shewn, how any part of that ground had acquired its goodness. "Who maketh thee to differ from another?" Long ago it was written for our instruction, that "the preparations of the heart in man and the answer of the tongue," the inward principle and the outward effect, "is from the Lord." And in after ages the necessity of divine influence was thus affirmed: "no man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me, draw him."—Of the Gentile world, I apprehend, we know so little, and the Scripture hath given so few details, that it will not be an easy matter to press them into the service of either party. To the curious inquirer into their spiritual condition, it may be replied as to another over-anxious person; "what is that to thee? Follow thou me." But if the little which the Scripture hath said concerning them, is wrested to an improper purpose, the violence done to it must be exposed, and it must be restored to its real use. In the quotation from the Romans (ii. 14.) nature is not put in opposition to an inward working of the Spirit of Grace, but to an outward and written law. The Apostle is led to speak of the two ordinary means of knowing and doing the will of God; the one by the contemplation of His works, (Rom. i. 19, 20.) the other by the revelation of His word. But of extraordinary assistances, either in favour of the existence of any such or against it, nothing is alleged. If conjectures are permissible, why should not He, who will write His written law on the hearts of all true Israelites, (Heb. viii. 10.) write also His unwritten law upon the hearts of honest and virtuous heathens? The law which is inscribed in the characters of nature, is the law of God, as well as the revealed and written law, and having the same

Author, they can have but one meaning and one end. Why then should there not be some degree of care on the part of God to impart a right knowledge of the one as well as of the other? Why is it incredible that Xenocrates, following the light of nature, should be led by the spirit to the discovery of truth or to a life of virtue, while we *must* believe, that a Christian, following the superior light of the gospel, cannot attain to truth or holiness, except he be also led by that Holy Spirit? Is God a respecter of persons? Are not His means of communicating himself to the heathen world, His rights to, and demands upon their obedience and their necessities, as great as in our own case? "Is the Spirit of the Lord straitened?" "Is He the God of the Jews only? Is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also."—When again it is said, that God "suffered all nations to walk in their own ways," (Acts xiv. 16.) the plain and unsophisticated sense of the words is, that He interposed not to guide them by a written revelation or an authorized declaration of His will. It is of importance also that it should be noted, that in Scripture language a man's own ways are ways of iniquity. (Isaiah liii. 6.) We cannot therefore please God, except we walk in ways which are not our own; in ways, into which we must be led, and in which we must be kept by the influence of another. "Thou compassed my path," saith the Psalmist; "whither shall I go from thy Spirit—lead me in the way everlasting." Nor is there an inconsistency between a supposed offer of grace and a man's walking in his own ways. For if free-agency be not destroyed, they, to whom the word of God is sent, and who have the offer of the spirit, may yet walk in their own ways. (Deut. xxx. 19.) In the conflict between contending principles, (Rom. vii.) to which C. P. next adverts, what is there to demonstrate that

the good is not originally from the Lord? 'It is not true,' says Secker, 'that, in strictness of speech, fallen man hath originally no principle of what is right left in him.' *If the whole was lost by the fall, somewhat hath, by the general Grace of God, been restored since.*' This is the great point for which we contend; we deny not the existence of something good, but affirm only, that in every thing good there is the presence of the preventing Grace of God. In every advance towards perfection, it will not be denied, that the increase and growth of the good principle and the diminishing and the decay of the bad, are to be attributed to God's Holy Spirit. Why then is not the beginning of the good, (Gal. v. 17. and Pool's Synopsis.) to be referred to the same original? Perfection being unattainable in this world, the conflict will never cease; but the more the spirit triumphs over the flesh, the more it is maintained and carried on by the power of grace. Since then the conflict is never supported with success except by the power of grace, where is the certainty, or even the probability, that it is not begun by the same power? How are we to be sure, that the something good is not of the nature of a thing lost and forfeited, but afterwards restored? As to his comment on the tenth article, nothing can be more palpable than the mistake of C. P. The works of which that article treats, are such as, under certain circumstances, through 'the Grace of God by Christ preventing us,' it is supposed, may and by all good Christians will be done. But since the spirit is given to man only by measure, works positively good and intrinsically righteous, can never be done by mere man, under any circumstances whatever, on this side of the grave. Therefore not positively, but relatively, good works must be the works designed: and the article must be expressly provided to declare, that even works of

relative goodness, by which alone man can serve God, cannot be done without His grace 'preventing us and working with us.'

Whatever powers C. P. may claim for fallen man, (if any such there can be) they will not be so much as questioned by me, if it be granted, that they are useless, and inapplicable for religious purposes, and ineffectual for his recovery from sin and destruction, except when aided by the grace of Christ. Total corruption, in my sense of the expression, is so entire a weakness, so utter an impotency, so perfect a depravity and so absolute an helplessness as to exclude the presence of every thing sound and good. 'There is no health in us' or strength; but however we might have exerted ourselves, we should have toiled in vain; however we might have struggled, we should have "stuck fast in the deep mire," if Christ had not put forth His hand, and extricated us from the ruins of the fall by the help of His Grace. I am led to this opinion by our Saviour's own plain and decisive saying: "Without me ye can do nothing." We are in every way so dependent, that even in civil or natural actions we are incapable of doing any thing without the Providence of God preventing and assisting us. But this saying of our Saviour evidently refers only to religious acts. But when limited to such actions why is not this saying to be literally understood? The literal sense is always to be presumed to be the true sense, unless strong reasons evince the contrary. It is the business therefore of those, who object to that sense, to produce their strong reasons against it. In the mean time I would willingly bring to the recollection of your readers the following remarkable extracts from Tillotson's Sermon on this saying of our blessed Saviour: 'A man cannot make himself good, he cannot convert or change himself; nor by his own strength continue and hold out in a good course;

we can do nothing of this, without the grace and assistance of Christ.' — 'We being weak and without strength, slaves to sin, and under the power of evil habits, and unable to free ourselves from this bondage *by any natural power left in us*, our blessed Saviour in great pity and tenderness to mankind, hath in his Gospel offered, and is ready to afford to us an extraordinary assistance of his grace and Holy Spirit, to supply the defects of our natural power and strength. And this supernatural grace of Christ is *that alone* which can enable us to perform what He requires of us. And this, according to the several uses and occasions of it, is by Divines called by several names. *As it puts good motions into us, and excites and stirs us up to that which is good, 'tis called preventing grace; because it prevents any motion or desire on our parts.*'—It (the Scripture) 'does constantly ascribe *all* the good that we do to the Grace of Christ.' 'When the Scripture speaks of the Redemption of Christ, it represents our condition not only as miserable, but *helpless.*' "For when we were yet *without strength*, in due time Christ died for the ungodly."— 'When mankind was under an *utter impotency* of recovering itself out of that state of sin and misery into which it was plunged, &c.'— 'When I say this grace and assistance is derived to us from our union, I do not intend to exclude the necessity of God's grace and Holy Spirit to the conversion of a sinner, and his first planting into Christ: but when we say that Christians derive the influences of grace and assistance from their union with Christ, this supposeth them to be Christians already, and planted into Christ, and that this likewise is the work of God's grace. For if we cannot bring forth fruit, without the aid and assistance of His grace, much less without that could we be planted into Him, and united to Him.' It can scarce be necessary

to observe, that one so wise and good does not neglect to fence his doctrine against erroneous notions of irresistible or indefectible grace. But with all these precautions he imputes the success, with which our endeavours may be crowned, and the virtue to which we may attain to the fact of our being prevented and 'assisted by God.'

As to the state of man in general, and the light this saying of our blessed Lord throws upon it, it is to be observed, that it was addressed to persons for the most part of honest, though uncultivated minds; to persons, who had heard the many gracious words which had fallen from Him, who had been attendants upon His ministry, eye-witnesses of His mighty works, and instructed in the way of truth. They must have made some progress in religion, having had the full benefit of most excellent doctrine, and of an unerring example to excite them to the utmost diligence in the performance of their duty. If then persons in their improved state could do nothing of themselves, but required the preventing and assisting grace of God to bring forth any fruit, what must be the necessities and the urgent wants of all other men less prepared and less advantageously circumstanced? With what degree of success could the unaided endeavours of strangers and aliens to work out their salvation be rewarded, when without the Spirit of Christ, the exertions of His chosen and favoured disciples must have been in vain, and productive of nothing truly good?

Another strong description of the helplessness and impotency of man without Christ, is the confession of the Apostle, (2 Cor. iii. 5.) which, though made with immediate reference to the work of the ministry, is applicable to all other things. "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think any thing as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God." For whatever degree of positive weakness

and insufficiency the Apostle was compelled to confess in regard to one thing, to the same extent and degree he must have been weak and insufficient in regard to all. The circumstance to which I particularly wish to draw the attention of your readers, is this: St. Paul makes no pretension to any 'partial degree of virtue' in himself. He arrogates not to himself a power to begin with the confession of a want of power to finish. He laments not a mere insufficiency to accomplish, to complete, to perfect a good work and bring it to an happy termination; he does not describe himself as naturally endued with powers to pay a part, but deficient in powers to pay the whole of a well-pleasing and acceptable service; but in terms, which are in no way dubious, he roundly asserts, that he is not sufficient of himself even to think any thing as of himself. But thinking must necessarily prevent or go before all rational speaking or acting. He therefore, who is careful to disclaim all power in himself of thinking, must be supposed to renounce in the most emphatic manner all pretension to a sufficiency to speak, or to do any thing good and righteous, except by the aid of the Grace of God. If, as the Apostle declares in another place, (1 Cor. ii. 14.) "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God," then it is impossible that we can order our conversation aright, except we be first enlightened and taught all such necessary truths by that Holy Spirit.

If we are to concede to C. P. 'a partial degree of virtue in men,' without the renewing power of the Holy Spirit, how are we to reconcile the existence even of this degree of virtue, with the generally received notion of preventing Grace? For this partial degree of virtue is evidently so much excellence, so much goodness, attained unto without the previous grace of Christ, without the efficacy of his merits, and indeed without any re-

ference or obligation to him. And though we may be strengthened and assisted by the Holy Spirit, to persevere in what we ourselves have begun well, yet how can we be said to be prevented in it? If there be any goodness or any virtue, which we of ourselves may attain unto, so much goodness or virtue prevents, instead of being prevented by, the grace of God. What shall we say then "of God's special grace preventing us?" It would be unreasonable to suppose, that we have power of ourselves, and power of the Spirit also. For God does not vouchsafe unnecessary aids, or suspend our own powers for the sake of employing powers provided by Himself. The idea which we are taught to have of grace is, that it is sufficient, that is, that it does enough, but not more than enough, to make our calling and election sure, if we be not wanting to ourselves. Either therefore power of ourselves, or preventing grace must be given up. And at what stage in the progress of a good work or of a general good course is assisting grace to come in to our help? Spiritual labours are dissimilar to many others in this respect. Many acquire the first rudiments of an art or science with ease, in which it is the lot of a very few only to attain distinction. But in spiritual labours the greater progress we make, the less difficulty do we meet with. In this case the first rudiments are the more difficult, and the going on unto perfection is the more easy. For in our way towards perfection, the greater progress we have made, the more is the enemy of our salvation baffled, and our hope of victory confirmed; the more is the disposition to do ill subdued, and the contrary habit of doing well acquired; the more sensibly is the pleasantness of religion felt, and the peaceableness of her ways experienced, and the more evident does the wisdom of doing well, and the folly of doing ill hourly become. In what part then of a particular good work,

REMEMBRANCE, NO. 34.

or of a general good course, can the assistance of the Holy Spirit be so requisite as at the beginning? When the body of sin is most powerful, when it is entire in all its parts, and no one member is yet wounded by the suppression of any evil propensity or by the acquirement of some degree of virtue, then is the conflict most arduous, and the assistance of the Spirit most needful and most to be desired. But it may perhaps be said, that preventing grace is the original of some good works, and not of others. What then is the design and the propriety of the petition, "prevent us in *all* our doings with thy most gracious favour, and further us with thy continual help; that in *all* our works *begun*, continued and ended in thee, &c.?" Or of the daily prayer, "O God, from whom *all* holy desires, *all* good counsels, and *all* just works do *proceed*?" While the Church most evidently considers it a point of duty to acknowledge and to pray for the presence of the preventing grace of God in all Christian virtues, will C. P. contend, that it is the fountain, from which some do, or others do not, spring? Will he hazard the assertion, that preventing grace is a principle irregular in its operation, and that dependence upon it is of so uncertain a nature, as to be our duty at one time and not at another? Would this resemble the probable working of One, who is "the same yesterday and to-day and for ever?"

If we may adopt the language of the Prophet, "O Lord, thou hast wrought all our works in us," we must ascribe all and every degree of "goodness, righteousness, and truth," whereunto we can attain to the Holy Spirit, and to the mighty working of His power. But if by his own strength, without the "special grace of God preventing" him, fallen man can attain unto "a partial degree of virtue," then may there exist a degree of virtue, in the production of which the Spirit has no share, and which cannot be as-

cribed to him. If we may be the authors and beginners, and the Spirit only an encourager and helper of a good work after it is begun, then it is not of the root, and cannot be numbered among the fruits of grace. When a work is the effect of the labour of more than one person, it is both customary and just to assign the honour and the praise of it to the author and prime mover of it; to that person, who began and set it on foot, and not to him, whose co-operation has extended to no more than some trivial and occasional help. The glory of it by right belongs to him, who has wrought through the whole progress of the work from the first commencement to the final termination of it, and not to that party who has only contributed some broken and interrupted aids, and who has borne only from some given time a certain burden of the entire work. Moreover, are not all our good works the fruit of faith? And is not faith the gift of God? A gift, which may indeed be rejected and declined, but which, wherever it is received, is vouchsafed by God. But if good works are the fruit of faith, and faith is the gift of God, how can we avoid the conclusion, that all our good works in all their parts proceed from God?

I do not pass over such passages as, "who were *dead* in trespasses and sins," "among whom also *we all* were by *nature* the children of wrath," God, "even when we were *dead* in sins, hath quickened us," and the like, because I esteem them unimportant, but because I have already trespassed greatly upon you. Nothing, however, short of an universal cause, could have produced so universal an effect, and a stronger figure cannot be employed to describe our corruption than that of death. Fearless then of "striking upon the Charybdis of Calvinism," I maintain the total corruption of man; such a corruption as supposes him destitute of *all* power

of recovering himself, and makes him a debtor to Christ Jesus for all and every part of his restoration. And I repeat my earnest wish, that it may be impartially considered by others, whether such total corruption, such an absolute helplessness, such an utter impotency, is separable from Calvinism, or not. While it is regarded as a doctrine, to which Calvinistic Predestination or irresistible grace is essentially united, it will not be fairly and equitably tried. If it be a true doctrine, confessed by Calvinists and denied by us, it will be a pillar and support to their cause, but the weakening and undermining of ours; and in all our controversies with persons of that persuasion, it will produce the result of an uncertain termination of the dispute, or, if the expression may be permitted, of a drawn battle. For whatever ground we may gain against them in one quarter, while the debate is upon other topics, the same ground will they quickly recover against us in another quarter, when the discussion is upon the powers of man in his fallen state, and his need of the preventing grace of his Redeemer. Let us then deprive them of the exclusive possession of that portion of truth which is the maintenance of their cause. The greater our inability is, the more is our need of an extraordinary power and of supernatural assistance, to enable us to do our duty. And our obligation to our Redeemer will be, according as we have received spiritual gifts and succours for our deliverance at the rate of ten thousand talents, or of an hundred pence. For they, to whom He has given most, will also love Him most. Let us then study to know the full extent of our own weakness and incapacity, and of our Saviour's mercy and goodness. What nobler object can employ the energies and the faculties of those, whom He hath ransomed, than an attempt to comprehend the depth of their Redeemer's love, to magnify

His mercies as they are worthy to be praised, and to raise their own gratitude to a just and corresponding measure of greatness?

I am, Sir, yours, &c.

W—r.

August 8, 1821.

Unpublished Correspondence between Wesley and Wogan.

(Continued from page 530.)

No. VI. *Fragment of a Letter from Wogan to one of Wesley's Friends.*

BUT the beginning of your Letter is somewhat too incautiously worded. You seem to blame your style and manner of expression in the former, and call it enthusiastic nonsense, holy flame, and an unintelligible style. I have read over again both your former letters, and my answers to them, and neither of them, as I conceive, could minister any occasion for so harsh a censure on your way of reasoning or expressing yourself at that time. I cannot find therein either nonsense or enthusiasm. The sentiment about the nature and turpitude of sin, which you say you had taken from Mr. Norris, is no way wrong or unintelligible. 'Tis obvious enough even to unassisted reason and natural conscience, to conceive the monstrous impiety and downright madness, as well as detestable ingratitude, of flying in the face and trampling on the laws of our Maker; who created, who preserves, and will hereafter judge us. Who alone is the author of our being and well-being; from whom alone we can expect the happiness we all naturally aspire after, either here or hereafter. Reason itself, I say, cannot but suggest such reflections as these, when we seriously attend to its voice. So that these her dictates are far from being unintelligible to a considerate man, much less nonsense: they are rather the

words of soberness and truth. This then was not the thing I had in my eye to caution you against in my last short letter, but the danger of the conclusion you seemed to draw from those considerations about sin, to wit "that, if duly weighed, they must necessarily produce in you an aversion thereto; that when a man has once gained this abhorrence of sin, he may then apply himself *with success* to contemplate heavenly things; that if he approach God with such a pure mind, the streams of grace will then *no doubt* so diffuse themselves through the whole man, that he will be ever nourished with the good things of God, he will be all spiritual and divine," &c. These are your words, which though true in some respects are not so in all. The conclusion you draw is too sudden; it will not always hold, yea hardly ever does either in nature or grace. To pass at once from one extreme to another, in any case of habitual dispositions, is very seldom seen, and much seldomer continued in. A heathen can inform us, *Naturam expellas furcâ licet, usque recurrit.*

And the shameful falls of *David*, *Peter*, &c. may also convince us of the like danger in a state of grace; and that the Apostle's caution is never out of season, "that he that stands should take heed lest he fall." This made me say, there are temptations you seem not aware of. Temptations peculiar to a state of piety. Satan, like a cunning sophister, suits his wiles to the situation or condition we are in. Fleshly and gross to those who live after the flesh; spiritual, to those who are led by the Spirit: puts on the disguise of an angel of light to those who have escaped the pollutions of the world; counterfeits humility, counterfeits devotion, counterfeits the very love of God. If he cannot withdraw from piety, he will even blow up the holy flame, to greater ardours and higher degrees than he

knows our thoughts or capacities are yet equal to. If he cannot prevail in the wilderness, if the appetites of the body, and soft calls of nature will not yield to his suggestions, he leads to the mountain to shew us the glories of the world. If these move us not, he transports us even to the pinnacle of the temple, exalts us above all our brethren that are within or about the house of God; but it is with an insidious intent to cast us down. He raises us to what some may call the top of perfection, but 'tis with a view of dashing our foot against the stones below, that so we may be discouraged and disabled from pursuing the course we had begun. That is, when neither bodily nor worldly lusts can tempt us to forsake our own steadfastness, and draw us from God, he falls in with the bent and holy fervours of the soul, and even urges us to come the nearer to him, that he may cause us to fall; verifies in us the story of Icarus and Phaeton, that we may perish by too near an approach to our sun. By this subtle device he turns our humility into presumption, our piety into spiritual pride, our devotion into enthusiasm or superstition. These are the temptations which (in my answer to your former letter) I hinted at, and cautioned you against; the which I said you then seemed not yet aware of, neither could well be, till a further advance in religion had given you some experience of them. Give me leave to refer you again to the little book of humility for further advice to direct your conduct in this most intricate maze which the enemy is preparing for you, that so with an Apostle you may have it to say, we know his devices, and be able to avoid them; that with the holy Psalmist you may more earnestly and clearly pray, "O that my ways were made so direct, that I might keep thy statutes." That you may not turn to the right hand or to the left, remembering that the way to life is straight as well as nar-

row; not only straight as to width, but as to rectitude also. In this straight way may Christ and his blessed Spirit ever guide and keep you; so shall you be safe from your enemies. Faith and humility are to be the two fences on your right hand and on your left; and while you walk steadily between these two, you shall keep in the way of peace, and never go astray.

I am, with much sincerity,

Dear Sir,

Your obedient humble Servant,

W. W.

24th Oct. 1733.

I thought of you this morning on hearing the 1st Lesson at Church, and recommend it to your perusal and meditation. And pray give my service to Mr. Wesley, whom you may communicate this letter to if you think proper. I have no thoughts of making any translation of Prudentius, having neither time nor ability for such a task.

No. VII. *Wesley to Wogan.*

Dear Sir,

I HAVE not till to-day had a convenient opportunity, thoroughly to consider the advice you was pleased to favour me with from Ealing, or to return you my sincere thanks for the books you have contributed towards the propagation of the Gospel of Christ in America. I find it will be necessary to spend some time here before I can even learn the Indian language: there being no place for me to live in near Mr. Musgrove, (who is to instruct us) till a house is built, upon which workmen are already employed. This therefore is the first work in our Lord's American vineyard, which he calls me to attend. There are in Savannah between six or seven hundred souls, from almost all nations, and of almost all religions: Germans, Dutch, Portuguese, French, Irish, Scotch, English, Jews, Lutherans, Calvinists, Anabaptists, and lukewarm Church of England men. Now

whom of these would you advise me to attempt? All, or some only? I am beginning with our own Churchmen, a few of whom are attendants on the daily prayers, and are resolved to be so at the weekly Sacrament. I see already, to plant the Gospel fully, even here, there will be need of the zeal and industry of an Apostle, and the wisdom of an angel: that is, in a word, of faith. O cease not to pray for me, that my faith fail me not!

I am, dear Sir,

Your obliged and affectionate
servant in Christ,

JOHN WESLEY.

Savannah, March 19, 1736.

No. VIII. *Wogan to Wesley.*

Dear Sir,

I MUST freely own I was not a little pleased (perhaps too much pleased) with the receipt of yours of the 19th of March last, from Savannah; because I had given over expecting such a favour: but you are pleased to excuse your silence to me before you left England. I was indeed contented to think what I had written was not worth your notice, and had only the satisfaction that I had thrown in my poor mite into the treasury of God, and that possibly it might be accepted of our blessed Master, because it was my all; all that was in my power to contribute towards the glorious design you have undertaken, and might, perhaps, some time or other prove of use through His blessing who was witness to my good will, as well as inability to do better. Nor will I conceal that I apprehended from some reports I heard, that you had conceived a jealousy against me of being a hindrance of that zeal which you thought it your duty to inculcate, and recommend to those pious friends you left behind. I mention not this from a spirit of disgust or resentment. No, my dear friend, I cannot but love all holy zeal for the honor of God and good of souls,

although it may exceed the due bounds, or even miss the mark, and like a random arrow, light upon me and wound me. Such an error, having a noble cause, is far more excusable than a cold indifference concerning what we judge to be wrong. Indeed, in God's cause, nothing should be thought indifferent. But the great art in our Christian calling is first to aim aright and frame right judgments, and then to proportion our zeal to the nature and importance of the subject. The best guide herein is doubtless the blessed Spirit of God, and next (in subservience thereto) our own reason. All truths in Religion are equally pure and holy, but not equally important or necessary. All are not fundamentals—some doctrines are *absolutely* necessary to salvation. Others but in a *secondary* degree, and according as they serve to establish prime truths. Some are more necessary for some to know, namely, for the teachers and professed ministers of the Gospel; while it may be sufficient for others, who are learners only in the School of Christ, to know the first principles of his doctrine.

In short every teacher should be well apprized of the different weight, as well as intrinsic excellence of all religious truths; and consequently thoroughly versed in *comparative* as well as *positive* Theology. A book I formerly read on this subject by a good hand, but have not now by me, proved of great use to settle my notions on this point. And I presume I need only suggest the hint to your ready mind; neither have I touched on this subject with any other view but to remove every the least obstacle to that Christian charity and benevolence which a different way of thinking in lesser matters may in some measure have weakened in you towards me. This I thought necessary to mention as a point of the greatest consequence between Christian friends, who, I trust, are engaged in the same good

design, and ought to take heed that they fall not out by the way. Nor do I expect or desire that you should make any other answer or return to this but love for love, such as I bear in my heart towards you in the bowels of Jesus Christ; and that you will remember me in your prayers.

You are pleased to acquaint me that your labour consists of a great variety of nations; and to ask which of them you should first begin with. This you have well replied to yourself, that you had best begin with the members of our own Church; for this is pursuant to our Lord's own example, and his Disciples who first applied to the sheep of the house of Israel before they turned to the Gentiles.

The Samaritans and Heathens had indeed a better disposition of mind for receiving the Gospel than the very people of God; and yet our Lord tells the woman of Samaria that *salvation was of the Jews*. We may apply the same to our own Church: that undoubtedly we have the truth, though by far too many it be held in unrighteousness. This observation points out the different method a preacher is to pursue in addressing to the members of our own Church and that of another persuasion. Repentance is more especially to be recommended to bad livers, and the doctrines of faith and right principles to those who (although virtuous persons) are not well established in the truth.

I wish you good success in the learning and use of the Indian language, and doubt not but the same God who inspired the first preachers with the knowledge of all languages will mercifully assist you: yea to speak them miraculously if he see fit. Nevertheless there is one language which is understood by all nations (who have not extinguished their natural light by vicious lives) and that is a holy and exemplary conversation. This is a more persuasive rhetorick than any tongue or speech can express. What I allude

to is well termed in our Version of the Psalms,

This powerful language to no realm,
Or region is confined,
'Tis nature's voice, and understood
Alike by all mankind.

And this language I trust you are, and still will be versed in more and more; so that I need not enlarge. "*Non magna loquimur sed vivimus,*" was the holy and true boast of the Primitive Christians, so should it be of all that name the name of Christ. To maintain a burning and shining light in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation, is the miracle and wonder that the propagators of the Gospel are now to perform.

But as the nature of man is ever subject to extremes, great prudence is necessary to order our conversation aright, so as not to dazzle the too weak eyes of some by too much light, nor hide our candle under a bushel when required to lighten the house. As the wise man observes, there is a *time* and a *season* for all things. So there is also a due proportion as to the degrees and measures which wisdom prescribes. As there is a time to be silent as well as to speak; there is in like manner a golden mean to be observed in our very example and conversation. David sometimes held his tongue and kept silence, *yea, even from good words*, though it was pain and grief to him. And our Lord not only refrained himself sometimes from speech before his adversaries, but told his disciples there were many things *they could not then bear*. Yea, I may venture to say, there are seasons when a Christian may with more discretion, and even to better purpose conceal his light than exhibit it. That you may not mistake me, and suspect I am pleading for lukewarmness and indifference in Religion, I must assure you I mean no other temporising than such as Christ and St. Paul used, who became all things to all men that he might save some.

This is one of the nicest points in all our Christian conduct, and requires the zeal of an Apostle with the prudence of an Angel to temper our behaviour aright between the two extremes. And what makes me touch upon this thing, is a declaration I heard you make, that you would never open your lips on any subject but Religion. It was your zeal I know prompted you to make this resolution. But, my dear friend, do not make the way to life straighter and narrower than God has made it, least you discourage rather than invite proselytes. An Apostle allows, yea requires, that our *conversation be seasoned with salt*; that is, not only with uncorruptness, but with wit and agreeableness of discourse, (for so *salt* in those days, you know, was generally used to signify, when referred to speech.) As the occasions of speech are various, and the tongues, capacities, and circumstances of men very different, it cannot be proper to entertain all alike in the grave, austere way of religious discourse, not only because (*Ridetur chorda qui semper oberrat eadem,*) it exposes our discourse and persons to contempt, but it defeats the very end we aim at. Our Lord calls his Disciples *fishermen*, and if we would catch *men*, it must be supposed that proper baits are to be used; else, no fish will come to your hook. This, or something like this, was the artifice used by St. Paul, when he speaks of some that he had caught even by guile. I recommend to you, therefore, and the holy Brethren with you, to study this excellent art. I need not much enlarge, because I am persuaded experience will teach you the necessity of it, and God himself, who only can, will assist you in the practice. And indeed I know nothing more difficult than this, therefore nothing wherein all men stand in need of, the aid of that blessed Spirit, who is to guide and lead us into all truth, Preciseness, and all affect-

ed singularity is one of the most dangerous diseases incident to piety. It sours our own spirit, and the spirit of others against us. It turns to that bitter zeal, which is the greatest enemy of charity, and throws a blemish on our name and all the good actions we do. Some persons have a natural cheerfulness which I esteem a happy talent, if governed by a sober piety. Others are more inclined by nature to the serious and grave; but if this complexion be animated by the joys of Religion, it renders us more amiable and respected in the eyes of others. Both these qualities are excellent instruments in the hands of a wise man, to gain souls, and to recommend the service of God; a service that is the most perfect freedom not only from sin and the sinful passions of the flesh, but from the fetters and restraints of all unnecessary particularities of preciseness and affectation.

Religion is doubtless the most amiable thing in the world. What the philosopher said of virtue, may more truly be said of Religion, that all who see her must needs be in love with her. Whatever, therefore, tends to lessen her beauty by any oddness in dress or appearance, in habit or looks, and clouds that easy, open, free and becoming air which is natural to her, must be carefully avoided by all that would be thought her friends. Permit me to represent what I mean under the character that PONTIUS gives of the great *St. Cyprian*: "His piety, his courage, his good nature, with the vigour and readiness of his whole administration, were all of them his distinguished excellencies. His aspect was venerable and yet pleasant; his countenance had a happy mixture in it of cheerfulness and gravity: his brow was neither too contracted nor too open, equally removed from both extremes of gaiety and severity, that it was hard to say, whether he was more to be feared or loved; but that

he equally deserved both. His garb was apiece with his countenance; sober and moderate, keeping a just distance from the extremes of sordidness and superfluity, which are but different effects of one and the same cause, and both proceed from a vain ostentation. So that I may well add what Clemens Alexandrinus says of the Christian life, and we should study to make his words true: Ὁ βίος ὁ Χριστιανῶν σύστημα τῆς λογικῆς πράξεως, a system of reasonable actions, not only influenced and animated by a lively faith in Christ, but governed by reason, and displayed in a course of rational actions. While I argue thus, I am arguing for the honour of Religion, which was not designed to extinguish but to improve our natural powers; not to destroy but to regulate our passions, to restrain our appetites but not to fret and torment them. As there is a time for mortification, so there is for joy and thanksgiving. Christ himself was nailed indeed to the cross, but did not remain there, his body descended into the grave, and his soul into hell, but was not left there. He rose again, he ascended, he entered into glory and joy. Thus also must we be conformed to his image; and as his service is a most reasonable service, so is he the best of masters:—let our looks as well as tongues express the delight, the joy, the satisfaction we feel therein. Avoiding the contrary extreme, as we would that Pharisaical spirit which persecuted him and opposed his doctrine. This is the heaven he warns us against, as the most inconsistent with that Grace, mercy, and peace which his gospel was designed to promote; and with that good-will towards men, which the angels recommended as well as proclaimed at his joyful nativity. The same I most ardently wish to you, and all that love our Lord Jesus in sincerity; and hope you will take in good part what I have written,

and with the same candour as designed by

Dear Sir, &c.

Ealing, 1st Aug. 1736.

P.S. A sudden journey into the North so straitens my time, that I have been obliged to make use of another hand, which you will therefore excuse. I was willing to leave an answer to you before I go, lest I should slip the opportunity when a ship offers for your parcel. Let this also be my excuse for omitting many things I had to say in relation to the young plantation you left behind, but I hope you will have the account from other hands. The little Catechism on Confirmation is now in print; as it seems to me a subject of great consequence to your present undertaking, I have thoughts of sending you some of them. My love and service to your brother and fellow-labourers in Christ's American vineyard.

To the Editor of the Remembrancer.

Sir,

THOUGH no advocate for the use of unauthorized Psalms or Hymns in the service of our Church, yet, as the custom seems to obtain very generally, especially in the metropolis, of singing at charity sermons hymns expressly composed for the occasion, I have presumed to send you the following, not from any idea of their merit, so much as the hope that they may be the means of calling forth more valuable contributions of a similar nature, which may form the groundwork of a general collection of hymns to which the managers of the many excellent charities, with which this country so happily abounds, may be able to apply, in the confidence of finding somewhat applicable to their individual charities, and every way *safe* and *proper* to be used. Yours, &c.

C.

I.

O Thou, that from the mouth of babes,
Art wont to perfect praise,
Almighty Father, hear the song,
That we thy children raise.

How blest are we, who early taught,
To know and love thy truth,
Far from the haunts of sinners spend
The morning of our youth.

And blest be they, whose pious care
Has wrought this work of love;
Yea, blest on earth, and still to be
For ever blest above.

Grant, Lord, our pray'r! and O, may still
The stream of bounty flow,
That thousands yet unborn may chaunt
Thy praise, as we do now.

II.

How pleasant is thy service, Lord!
How pure and perfect is thy word!
How rich the treasures of thy grace
Offer'd to all the human race!

And still to swell the vast amount
Of mercies that no tongue may count,
How sure the promise freely giv'n
Of endless life through Thee in heav'n!

O! be it our's in choicest lays,
To hymn our great Redeemer's praise;
For we have learnt from earliest youth,
The blessings of the Gospel truth;
And taught with pious care to shun
The ways wherein the wicked run,
Delight to spend our youthful days,
In faith, obedience, pray'r, and praise.

III.

O! for an angel's voice to sing
The praises of the Lord!
Whose love in streams of mercy flows
Through ev'ry work and word.

Tho' poor our lot, his bounteous care
Can ev'ry want supply;
Tho' low our state, his grace can raise
The lowest to the sky.

These friends, the guardians of our youth,
We owe but to his love,
With all our comforts here below,
And all our hopes above.

O! then through life's eventful course,
That love be still our song,
As infancy, and youth, and age,
Successive roll along.

NEWDIGATE PRIZE POEM.

By the Hon. G. W. F. Howard, of Christ Church, Oxford.

PÆSTUM.

'Mid the deep silence of the pathless wild,
Where kindlier nature once profusely smil'd,
Th' eternal Temples stand;—untold their age,
Untrac'd their annals in historic page;
All that around them stood, now far away,
Single in ruin, mighty in decay;
Between the mountains and the azure main,
They claim the empire of the lonely plain,
In solemn beauty, through the clear blue light,
The Doric columns rear their massive height,
Emblems of strength untam'd; yet conquering Time
Has mellow'd half the sternness of their prime,
And bade the lichen, 'mid their ruins grown,
Imbrown with darker tints the vivid stone.
Each channel'd pillar of the fane appears
Unspoil'd, yet soften'd, by consuming years;
So calmly awful, so serenely fair,
The gazer's heart still mutely worships there.

Not always thus, when beam'd beneath the day;
No fairer scene than Pæstum's lovely bay;
When her light soil bore plants of every hue,
And twice each year her storied roses blew;

While bards her blooming honours lov'd to sing,
 And Tuscan zephyrs fann'd the eternal spring.
 Proud in the port the Tyrian moor'd his fleet,
 And wealth and commerce fill'd the peopled street;
 While here the rescued mariner ador'd
 The sea's dread sovereign, Posidonia's lord,
 With votive tablets deck'd yon hallow'd walls,
 Or sued for Justice in her crowded halls.
 There stood on high the white-robed Flamen—there
 The opening portal pour'd the choral prayer;
 While to the o'er-arching heaven swell'd full the sound,
 And incense blaz'd, and myriads knelt around.

'Tis past: the echoes of the plain are mute,
 E'en to the herdsman's call, or shepherd's flute;
 The toils of art, the charms of nature fail,
 And Death triumphant rides the tainted gale.
 From the lone spot the trembling peasants haste,
 A wild the garden, and the town a waste.
 But they * are still the same; alike they mock,
 The invader's menace, and the tempest's shock;
 Such ere the world had bow'd at Cæsar's throne,
 Ere yet proud Rome's all-conquering name was known,
 They stood,—and fleeting centuries in vain
 Have pour'd their fury o'er the enduring fane;
 Such long shall stand—proud relics of a clime
 Where man was glorious and his works sublime;
 While in the progress of their long decay,
 Thrones sink to dust, and nations pass away.

ECCLESIASTICAL ANECDOTES.

THE learned Henry Wharton, whose life has been recently published by Dr. D'Oyly, in an Appendix to the life of Archbishop Saneroff, gives the following curious account of his motives for reviewing Burnet's History of the Reformation. The review was subsequently published under the assumed name of Anthony Harmer.

1692, Die. 3. Octobris. Historiam Reformationis Anglicanæ a Burneto scriptam evolvere cœpi, eo animo ut defectus et errores ejus notarem, ac demum evulgarem. Quod facere statui, tum ut nimiam ejus, quâ in damnum Ecclesiæ abusus est, famam convellerem; tum ut Historiæ nostræ Ecclesiasticæ errores receptos posteris indicarem;

tum ut animo meo multis ab eo injuriis irritato nonnihil indulgerem.

In the CHARACTERS of La Bruyere, under the head PULPIT, we have the following account of the effect which was produced upon the Parisians by Bourdaloue's piety and eloquence.

It was an admirable discourse—the most essential articles of our religion, and the most affecting motives for our conversion, were handled in such a manner, that they could not fail to reach the understandings and hearts of his hearers. His hearers were deeply affected; and they solemnly determined that the sermon just heard, was better even than the last which he had preached.

* The Temples.

Amy Perrin was put to death in 1542, at Geneva, charged with a design to massacre the French inhabitants of that town. The Catholics have asserted that he was innocent of this crime; and that his real offence was opposition to the supremacy of Calvin; but they add, that he fully merited his fate, and that his punishment afforded a conspicuous instance of divine retribution. When the Reformation was brought about at Geneva, Perrin, who was captain-general, removed the stone from the great altar of the cathedral, to the place of public execution, and fitted it up as a block. He was himself the first person who stained it with his blood—being beheaded on it, in consequence of the conspiracy which was imputed to him by Calvin.

Nothing was so grievous to the eyes and the minds of the Puritans, as the old customs observed on the 1st of May. At the restoration of Charles II. they kept up their hostility to the hated games, by printing and reprinting, more than once, *Funebria Floræ*, or *The Downfall of May-Games*. I think it curious to observe, adds Mr. Todd, (from whose *Memoirs of Brian Walton*, we borrow the anecdote) in regard to this pamphlet, that it presents a similar method of arguing to that which Bishop Sherlock, in later times, has shewn in his *Trial of the Witnesses*. In the *Downfall*, Flora, the patroness of May-Games, is formally indicted; addressed by the judge, and submits to be tried by a jury; upon which the judge exclaims, "Thou hast well said, thou shalt have a full, a fair, and a free hearing." The crier is then directed to call witnesses, when *Holy-Scripture* comes forward, and delivers his testimony against these games: then *Pliny*, *Lactantius*, and others down to a Mr. *Elton*, "a man eminent for piety and well-known integrity in his time." After much interchange of judicial

and formal remarks, sentence is finally given against poor Flora.

Archbishop *Warham* made *Erasmus* a present of a horse. The latter returned thanks in the following terms. "I have received your horse, who is not over handsome, but a good creature; for he is free from all the mortal sins, except gluttony and laziness. In other respects he is endued with the qualities of a father confessor, being prudent, modest, humble, chaste, and peaceable, and one who neither bites nor kicks."

When Bernard Gilpin, whose piety, and charity and zeal, and unwearied activity, and powerful eloquence had gained for him the title of the Apostle of the North, was pressed on a time to read a book of Thomas Cartwright's, exceedingly liked by many in those days, touching ecclesiastical discipline, and was shortly after, before he had well read it through, requested to return it, with his opinion of its merits, he is said to have concluded his letter with four lines in Latin, which are thus concisely translated by his biographer, Bishop Carleton:

"Much have I read, but more remains behind;

I'll read the rest when I can leisure find:
Men wish our Church no blemish had at all:

It cannot be so here; in heaven it shall."

The Impropriety and Injustice of considering Tithes as a Tax upon Land; an Impediment to its Improvement: or as occasioning Disputes between the Rector and his Parishioners.

It is asserted by the agriculturist, 1st. That tithes are a vexatious tax, impost or burthen upon the land.—2dly. That they hinder the improvement of the land.—3dly. That they engender hostility between the rec-

tor and his parishioners: and produce defection from the Established Church.—4thly. That the remedy for these evils is for government to sell the tithes, and to undertake to pay the Clergy in a way *to besomewhat contrived and adjusted: i. e. after taking the property of the Clergy away without reflection, they then are to consider how, or whether they can pay them for it!* 1st.—The first of these propositions that tithes are a vexatious tax, impost or burthen upon the land: contains a fallacy as gross, as it is convenient: for without this sandy foundation, it would be difficult to raise any question upon this subject at all. *Tithes are not a tax upon the land*, but a freehold interest in the land, whose title is as ancient, as clear, as strong and as equitable as that to the soil itself. What would be thought of any one who should say that rent was a vexatious burthen upon the land? Yet this might be said with quite as much reason as that tithes are so. The former is paid out of the labour, and the produce of the capital of the cultivator, as much as the latter. The farmer willingly and knowingly, enters into a contract to pay *both rent and tithes*, where they are due. Why then should he uniformly strive to diminish or evade the payment of the tithes? Whilst he even prides himself upon punctually discharging the rent? How can he honestly attempt to lessen, or avoid the payment of tithes? Is it good policy to encourage the farmer in such an attempt, which the agitation of this question has a strong tendency to do? But tithes being *property* and not a tax, they ought to be held as inviolable as any other species of property. Tithes are in their origin of divine right, as set apart by the Almighty, for the maintenance of a duly consecrated priesthood, officiating at the altar, under the religion taught by Moses, which was introductory to that of Jesus Christ; they have been paid ever since

landed property was known, even from the time of the patriarch Abraham, down to the present day. See Genesis chap. xxviii. 22. and Hebrews, chap. vii. 9, 10. 1 Corinthians, chap. ix. 13, &c.—nay the account of Abraham's paying tithes to Melchisedec, and the History of Jacob, shew that the custom of paying a tenth part, not only of spoils in war, but of corn, herds, fruits, &c. to the priesthood was even before the law was given by Moses. The last action of Melchisedec *the priest of the most High God* (B.C. 1913 years,) which stands upon record is his receiving tithes from Abraham: on which subject, the best confirmation and comment is to be found in the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. But the agriculturist and the dissenter, both join in the assertion, *that the taking of tithes in any way is extremely illiberal*, (although each of these characters if by chance they are impropiators) take the tithe not only to its full extent, but often in kind.

Let us proceed then on the question of the Clergyman's right to his tithes, and consider it *merely as founded upon the law of the land*. The origin of tithes certainly, wherever they exist, is referable to the Jewish law, coinciding in this particular with the plainest principles of natural justice: but all this shall be waved, nor will it be denied, that it may be within the province of just legislation, to interfere with property in general: but nevertheless any partial interference with it, must be *unjust* and may be *tyrannical*. This principle perhaps, is not always adhered to: but whatever may be thought of cases, in which the interest comparatively of a few individuals is on one side, and that of the community on the other: and where a compensation to the injured party is to be awarded, by a British judge and jury; these cannot be brought forward as a precedent where the rights proposed to be invaded, are those

of so numerous a body as the Clergy, and where the persons to be profited at their expence *can by no means be considered as the public*. But supposing that tithes are an objectionable or an impolitic species of property, even *that* cannot authorize the meddling with them, particularly under the false idea of their being a tax upon property. Objections against other kinds of property, might be made with equal ease. But it is further urged, that the incomes of some of the Clergy are very great: and why should they not be so? Is not the land divided into very unequal portions? Are not great fortunes derived from every profession, trade or occupation? Is not this country distinguished beyond all others, by the liberty that every man born in it has to acquire the greatest honours or wealth? Whilst thus the highest prizes *are open to all*, no reasonable man will complain, if he fails to attain them. There is such a disposition in many persons (and especially amongst the dissenters) to regard with jealousy any thing like affluence in the Clergy, as is quite unaccountable. The most splendid fortune acquired by any other liberal profession, the greatest income squeezed out of the meanest calling, excites no uneasiness: why then should the income of Clergymen alone be regarded with aversion? In what other class of men equally numerous, is to be found more talent or respectability? What other description of persons, spend their property with more credit to themselves, or more utility to the public? The Clergy in asserting their legal claims, cannot be considered, either as unjust, or arrogant! And he must seek in vain, who seeks for even a colourable pretext, for disturbing the rights of the sacerdotal order.—2dly. It is said, it is not intended to deprive the Clergy of their tithes, without giving them an equivalent for that right, which it is affirmed, hinders the improvement

of the land. Supposing they are to have a real equivalent, it is not easy to see who is to be benefited by the exchange; and if neither the landlord nor the tenant are to gain by it, how is the improvement of the land to be assisted? But why should the tithes be an obstacle to improvement? When an estate is purchased, or taken to farm is not the first question, whether it be tithe-free? And is not the price of the rent regulated accordingly? It is true that the value of the tithes will in general be increased in proportion to the improvement of the land: and it appears to be the very object of the law, that by this mean the property of the Clergy, should increase with the increasing wealth of the country: but where is the proof that tithes are a check upon improvement? Whoever considers what has been done even during the last twenty years in that way, will not easily be led to believe that *more* would be attempted if tithes were abolished tomorrow.—3dly. It is asserted that "*tithes create hostility between the rector and his parishioners, and cause their defection from the Established Church*." That such disputes occasionally exist cannot be denied: but to assert that they bear any proportion, to the number of parishes in which they do not occur, is unjust and untrue.

The fair question is, are the Clergy to be blamed for those disputes? It is somewhat hard to be deprived of what is due to them: it is still harder to be blamed for not submitting tamely to injustice: but surely it is the very climax of oppression to take from a man his rights in point of law, merely because he resists their invasion *in point of fact*. It is observed those disputes are said to turn in general on the *value of the tithes*, but will any one be bold enough to say, that the Clergy ever demand more than its value? It is impossible that they should receive it, if they did! Those with whom they

have to do, are neither careless nor ignorant of pecuniary matters. Who knows so well the value of the tithe as the farmer? Is he likely to make an extravagant composition? On the other hand the maximum of the tithe-owner is very clearly defined, *it is the commodity itself*. As to defection from the Church little need be said: that is a matter for the agriculturist or landlord, to settle with his own conscience. Of what value a man's religion is to himself or to the community, who deserts the worship of God, because he is not permitted to defraud his neighbour, is clear: and it is strongly to be suspected that those who are most apt to dispute with the Clergy, do not want this motive to induce them to avoid the Church; and that their notions of religion and morality are pretty much upon a level. On this subject, however, one fact is worth a thousand arguments. The income of my rectory in Buckinghamshire, arises from glebe in commutation for tithes, whilst the income of my rectory in Norfolk arises from tithes, and about 18 acres of glebe; they are both of the same value.

During my incumbency on the former since 1798, the parishioners (without any other ostensible reason, than because they think themselves perfectly independent of the rector) have interfered in every instance, with my ecclesiastical and secular rights: and though the resident curate is a gentleman highly respectable both in his performance of the duties of the cure and in his private character, they have procured a licence for a cottage, in which a dissenter (and most frequently a lay-

man) preaches twice on Sunday. In the Norfolk parish, of which I personally perform all the duties, there are none who habitually absent themselves from the Church; there are no dissenters, nor any meeting; and I have lived for twenty years upon the most cordial terms with my parishioners; excepting only for five years, during a contest with one dissenting farmer, of notoriously bad character! Would not the conduct of the parishioners have been diametrically opposite, if tithes were the true causes of dissension? The difficulties of the present times, are indeed great; but they are not insuperable: let us then meet them firmly and honestly: let every one patiently sustain his own share of the pressure, and not endeavour to fix it on the shoulders of his neighbour: remembering that if it be the duty of a Christian to bear the burthens of other men, it is more incumbent on him patiently to sustain his own.

Note.—When in lieu of taking the tenth in kind, the minister consents to take a composition in money for the same, as an accommodation to both parties, it is entirely at the option of the farmer, whether he will pay the sum demanded: if he thinks it too much, the only consequence is, tithe is taken in kind, and as the quantity so taken, can never exceed the minister's right, what becomes of the charge of exaction, or grievance in any possible case? and in point of equity, the thing is impossible, for no claim, can be unjustifiable, that is confined within the bounds of right!

A NORFOLK RECTOR.

REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

An Enquiry into the Doctrines of Necessity and Predestination. In four Discourses, preached before the University of Oxford. With Notes, and an Appendix on the seventeenth Article of the Church

of England. By Edward Copleston, D.D. Provost of Oriel College, Oxford, and Prebendary of Rochester. 8vo. 220 pp. Murray. 1821.

The right Method of interpreting Scripture, in what relates to the Nature of the Deity, and his Dealings with Mankind, illustrated, in a Discourse on Predestination, by Dr. King, late Lord Archbishop of Dublin, preached at Christ Church, Dublin, before the House of Lords, May 15, 1709, with Notes by the Rev. Richard Whately, M.A. Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. 8vo. 140 pp. Murray. 1821.

DR. COPLESTON observes, in the commencement of his first Sermon, "that one of the earliest religious practices of rude nations is to consult the Deity about that which is to come; plainly implying, that foresight, which is the strongest evidence of superiority among men, must belong to God in a far more eminent degree." To this just remark we may add, that the very men who thus demonstrate their belief in God's foreknowledge, are at the same time fully convinced of their own free will; and in the act of enquiring into the decrees of the Almighty, entertain a design of counteracting such as are unfavourable to themselves. The father seeks to learn what dangers menace his children, that he may be able to surmount them. Nation makes war against nation, and tribe against tribe, and both parties are anxious to learn the secrets of futurity; not merely that they may know, but also that they may obviate that which is about to happen. They believe at one and the same time in foreknowledge and in free-will; and it may humble the pride of human reason and learning to remember that those persons who take the clearest view of Predestination and its kindred questions, who reverently acknowledge God's Providence, and temperately assert man's liberty, admitting that they are unable to reconcile or explain them: those persons are only wiser than the American savage, by being able to give an account of their igao.

rance. The ignorance itself is just the same in all. The difficulty which exists now has existed from the beginning. And the only real improvement which has taken place or can be expected to take place is, that the wise and the philosophical cease to plume themselves upon their superiority, and be contented with those notions which they partake with the generality of their fellow-creatures.

Viewing the subject in this light, we cannot join in the displeasure which is often expressed against those who prolong or even who originated the controversy respecting liberty and necessity. 'In an evil hour,' says Mr. Southey in his *Life of Wesley*, 'did the busy mind of man devise for itself the perilous question of fatalism.'—If we look merely to the strife which the question has produced, we may assent, without hesitation, to this remark. But if we turn to the actual nature and constitution of man, we must doubt whether he could have avoided the debate. From what he felt within himself, he always knew that he was free; from what he heard or discovered of a Deity, he knew that God must foresee and govern. And it would have been most strange and unaccountable if our busy and meddling minds, ever prone to extremes, to exaggeration, and to paradox; ever prone to advocate theories which may excuse and vindicate corrupt practices; disposed almost in equal proportions to dogmatise and to doubt, had not entangled themselves in a question of so much real perplexity, and which does actually come home to the business and bosoms of us all. If we have any serious and sufficient reason to suppose either that God's Providence or that man's freedom is a dream, we are in the one case deprived of every solid support, and exposed to the freaks of chance; in the other we are passing our lives in a state of constant delusion, cheated by the faculties which should teach and direct us, and

uncertain even of our existence itself. The apprehension of such calamities must naturally be expected to unsettle the mind which entertains them. And when men see a danger which menaces them on one side, we may calculate that they will in most instances rush headlong to the other. Thus the advocates for Providence denied the liberty of man: and those who could not be persuaded to disregard the dictates of consciousness, rejected the government, if not the existence of God. The Stoic desired to establish and support religion and morality—but he overshot his mark, and discarded Providence for Fate. The Epicurean played a meaner part; and advocated licentiousness by submitting every event to chance. While those who pretended to stand neuter, and to moderate between the parties, either did not know the secret by which the knot might be untied, or were too much in love with scepticism to put an end to the debate. It was handed down in all its vehemence, and all its perplexity to Christian sages, and may be traced even by the least acute observer, through many a century of darkness, through many a volume of learned sophistry, and inconclusive ratiocination.

The same difficulties were at the root of the Oriental mythology, which represented the earth as the work of an inferior and even an evil spirit, who was strong enough to resist the delegated power of the Deity, and was only to be subdued at last by the direct interposition of the MOST HIGH. These tenets notoriously infected some of the earlier Christians, and their fruits are still visible in the doctrine of man's total pollution, and the redemption of a select few out of the great mass of the condemned. It seems therefore that the same questions have arisen always and every where. The antient sages of Asia and of Europe, the Mahometan

doctors, the Christian Fathers, the monks in the retirement of their cloister, and the Freethinkers in the midst of their dissipation are all divided into parties and sects upon this grand topic; and we may infer that it is a topic which man must necessarily discuss, and that in spite of the inconveniences which attend it, the discussion is inevitable. If this conclusion be correct, it will follow that instead of lamenting over the existence of the controversy, we should prepare ourselves to conduct it with skill; and instead of turning away from the subject as from a source of error and confusion, we should consider it as a mist which extends over the whole intellectual territory; in which no one need lose his way, provided he advances with care. Instead of declining, therefore, we should court the consideration of these questions:—the explanation of them should form a regular branch of liberal learning, and the less educated classes should be made acquainted with the result of our enquiries.

We are aware that an opposite theory is in existence if not in fashion. It is said that a speculative belief in fatality can do little or no harm: that the Calvinists, in spite of their errors, are as good as their neighbours; that their tenets are not really chargeable with the monstrous consequences which are imputed to them; and that the safest and best plan is to leave their doctrines alone; and to co-operate with them in good works, rather than argue about unintelligible mysterious points of faith. This advice sounds well; and if the statements by which it is preceded were all true, we should have no objection to follow it. But we cannot see that the advocates or apologists for modern calvinism, are the properest people in the world to make a correct estimate of its effects. For we are told continually, and we hope truly, that at the present day

few believers in Calvin are disposed to lay much stress upon their peculiar tenets, or to encourage that assurance which their doctrines seems to authorize. And the consequence is, that a congregation which is moral and pious in spite of its calvinism, has imbibed that system in a very diluted preparation, if it has not altogether escaped it. The old story of the apothecary and his convalescent patient may be applied to such cases. The disease had subsided, and the medicines were extolled; but as they happened to have been standing unregarded on the shelf, their actual share in the good work was less than their compounder imagined. In like manner, if we are told that the Scotch, the Dutch, and the Swiss, have calvinistic creeds, and calvinistic teachers, and nevertheless are celebrated for the superior purity of their manners, we may answer, that the dose which is supposed to be so salutary, has never in point of fact been administered; that the calvinism which is professed is not always believed, and that even when believed, is very seldom inculcated. We must turn therefore to those seasons in which zeal has got the better of prudence, and the Predestinarian has preached as he thought, or we shall never be able to form a just opinion of his faith. We must listen not to such as say that Predestination is seldom insisted upon, and infer somewhat illogically that it is a harmless phantom, but to such as have actually witnessed the preaching of that doctrine, and have borne an unequivocal testimony to its effects. In the days of Cromwell and the puritans, calvinism was taught in good earnest; and Baxter, one of its wisest and most learned disciples, has given a melancholy picture of the antinomianism to which it led. In the days of Wesley and Whitfield, the spirit of fanaticism revived—and stronger language has never been employed in the descrip-

tion of heresy and confusion, than that in which Wesley and Fletcher painted the Calvinistic doctors of their day. In our own time we have seen a secession from the Church and even from the Gospel, of which calvinism was indisputably the cause; and one Calvinist, Mr. Hall of Leicester, has candidly confessed the fact. Similar cases might be collected in every other age and country; and they authorize us to conclude that whenever a Calvinist improves his congregation, he does it by the concealment of his creed—and that whenever he brings his system fairly into play, it leads to confusion, and heresy, and all ungodliness.

Perhaps it will be said that this statement contains its own answer, as it admits that in the majority of instances, Calvinists do not teach the mischievous tenets which they maintain, and thus acquits them of producing the evils which are laid at their door. If the direct, and immediate production of immorality were the only charge which could be brought against them, we should be disposed to acquiesce in this excuse, and to confess that occasional and temporary confusion would be the worst that they could now produce. A practical belief in the doctrine of absolute decrees must be always very rare. It is improbable that in the present age the system should flourish as a theory; and when it has perplexed and captivated the understanding, it will be rejected by common sense. Thinking men have at length pretty generally agreed about the merits of that reasoning which proves us to be necessary agents. "The opinion of necessity," says Bishop Butler, "is essentially destructive of all religion." And this general assertion is to be understood, as he informs us, in two senses; "first, in a practical sense, that by this notion atheistical men pretend to satisfy and encourage themselves in vice, and justify to others their dis-

regard to all religion. And secondly, in the strictest sense that it is a contradiction to the whole constitution of nature, and to what we may every moment experience in ourselves, and so overturns every thing*.' When the Bishop made this observation, the philosophy of Hobbes was still in repute, and the philosophy of Hume was just preparing to supersede it. But the common sense of the age was too strong for the acuteness and ingenuity of them both, and the cause of atheism has ultimately lost ground in this country by being coupled in the case of these celebrated men with the cause of necessity and fatalism. The system 'which contradicts the whole constitution of nature,' contradicts the plainest dictates of the human understanding, and tends so evidently to overturn† every thing, that it must be false and delusive. This is felt and acknowledged wherever the intellects are sound. The feeling is an effectual bar to the progress of calvinism, and a powerful though not a universal remedy for the moral evil which it produces. But then unhappily the same circumstance operates injuriously upon our faith; and the more, difficulty men find in becoming practical Predestinarians, the more difficulty must there be in believing that a book which teaches that doctrine, can really be a revelation from God.

If we were enquiring whether Calvinism be or be not the religion of the Bible, it might not be proper to make this remark. The truth or falsehood of the system is not to be

proved by the facility with which mankind are disposed to embrace it, but by a strict reference to the volume in which it is said to be contained. When, however, this question has been decided, when it is admitted that a certain doctrine is not revealed to us by God; and it only remains to determine whether we shall refute and expose it, then is the time to ask whether the error be important or unimportant? And if it tends to make our conduct less scrupulous, or our duty more arduous, or our faith more unacceptable, we shall be bound to declare and prove the fact, and controvert the false doctrine as often as it appears.

This, therefore, is the answer which we wish principally to return to those who do not acknowledge the truth of Calvin's theory, but still take upon themselves to blame its more systematic and vigilant opponents. The theory is calculated to destroy the very distinction between right and wrong; and if this effect be not produced, the non-production is to be referred either to the silence of the preacher or to the positive refusal of the congregation to receive his instruction. Both circumstances are equally unfavourable to the cause of revelation. For why should a preacher conceal what God has made known for our instruction*,—how shall we persuade the infidel that a volume comes from the Almighty, when he

* Analogy, Part I. Chap. 6.

† Nothing can be more simple than the process by which this is effected. We think that our actions are under our own controul. If we are deceived in a matter of such importance, and apparent certainty, how can we be assured of any fact whatsoever? If consciousness plays us false, reason may be suspected of similar practices, and we must doubt the existence even of ourselves and of the Deity,

* In the funeral sermon on which we commented last month, Mr. Wilson says, that the party in whose name he is speaking, "cannot, dare not, wholly conceal any part of Scripture," p. 70. We should be glad to know why they should conceal it at all? St. Paul certainly did not set them the example. The election and predestination of which he speaks, are placed in the most conspicuous situation, in the very head and front of his Epistles—and if Calvinists imitate the Apostle, they cannot advert to the subjects too often. They confess their inability to do this, on account of the bad effects that have ensued, and will ensue: and the inference is, that he and they speak of very different things.

is told that it contains doctrines which are repugnant to common sense. The truth of Christianity is established both by its external and its internal evidence. In the present state of society, the latter is quite as important as the former. And it is so seriously impaired by the theory of Calvin, that we should be traitors to our trust if we suffered that theory to gain ground without entering a vigorous protest against its reception and against its truth. Deists of all ranks and classes find an excuse for their infidelity in the picture which Calvin has drawn of the God of the Christians. We have ourselves seen a letter from one of the uneducated disciples of Tom Paine and Carlile, in which the writer assumed that absolute predestination was the doctrine of the Bible, and argued with great acuteness that therefore it could not come from God. The same objection is urged by the whole unfortunate crew, and we are bound by every tie to remove the stumbling block out of their way. Deism is no match for the genuine unsophisticated Gospel. But if our mob of modern reasoners believe that the Gospel is calvinistic, a large portion of them will be persuaded to reject it altogether, and a larger will take it for granted that the writers of Scripture were only partially inspired; that the copies now in our hands are full of errors and interpolations, and that we are at liberty to reject any passage that offends us. The Socinians will not fail to take advantage of the circumstance; they will assert that upon their method of interpretation alone the cause of religion will prosper; and the semi-Christianity which they teach, and which is the most seductive heresy of the day, will flourish more and more. To check the progress of these evils is one branch of the clerical office, and the task can never be accomplished except by proving the anti-calvinism of the Bible and of the Church. As Deists

multiply on one hand, and fanatics on the other, this duty becomes every day more urgent; and it is some consolation to observe, that the debt is so generally acknowledged, and so promptly discharged. The volumes that have been published during the last ten or a dozen years upon the different branches of the calvinistic controversy, are not without their fruits. The answers that are made to our great Prelates and theologians, are becoming gradually feebler and more reluctant. So great is the moderation of our once active and spirited minority, that neither Mr. Sumner nor Mr. Young have been troubled with a refutation. And these circumstances, together with the practice already mentioned of *not wholly but nearly concealing* the more prominent doctrines of Calvin, encourage us to hope that his theory is on the decline; and that if the Universities are careful in sowing the seeds of a better system, some of us may yet live to witness the return of unanimity and peace.

We are happy to have it in our power to add the names of Copleston and Whately to the long and noble list of contemporary divines who have taken a part in this important contest. And although we cannot say that they have accomplished the entire work which they take in hand, yet are they entitled to our hearty thanks for what has been done. Dr. Copleston informs us in his Preface, that the leading argument of his first discourse was suggested to him by a publication of the late Mr. Dawson of Sedbergh, in which that celebrated mathematician argued against *Philosophical Necessity*, by shewing that wherever it is firmly believed motives cease to operate, and that if the faculties were enlarged, the understanding enlightened, and the apprehension quickened in that degree which is ultimately expected, the progress of knowledge would at length terminate in absolute inactivity. And

as it is observed throughout nature that activity accompanies intelligence, he contends that it is absurd to suppose that the perfection of the latter should produce the total destruction of the former. Dr. Copleston very justly observes, that the moral consequences of the hypothesis in question will lead to a similar result, since the notion of a moral agent gifted with mental powers, the improvement of which naturally tends to the weakening or extinction of moral principle, is an absurdity conclusive against the truth of the hypothesis from which it flows. The establishment of these positions forms the main business of the first discourse. In the second, the difficulties arising out of the belief of a superintending Providence as compatible with the free will of man; are considered. In the third discourse, what has been proved of natural religion is transferred by analogy to the calvinistic doctrine of Predestination. Reference is made to Archbishop King's Sermon on Predestination and Foreknowledge, and a Note contains a full account of that admirable work, a vindication of it against the answers which it has called down from various quarters, and a general dissertation upon the mode of reasoning by analogy. The last discourse shews that the doctrine of the Church of England upon these subjects is agreeable to Scripture; and that they both maintain the foreknowledge of God and the free-will of man, without attempting to explain their union, or permitting one to obliterate the other. An Appendix upon the seventeenth article, contains a neat and useful summary of the arguments by which anti-calvinistic churchmen have so often proved that the doctrine of absolute election and reprobation is not the doctrine of our Church.

Mr. Whately's publication is intimately connected with the one which has been just described. 'The immediate occasion,' as he informs us,

'of editing Archbishop King's discourse, is the commendation bestowed upon it by Dr. Copleston.' And the arguments by which the Doctor conceives that he has thrown new light upon his intricate subject, are adopted for and expanded by his able coadjutor. It must be observed, however, that Mr. Whately concludes a handsome acknowledgment of the information and benefit which he has derived from his Provost, by distinctly stating that Dr. Copleston is not to be considered as responsible for any thing contained in Mr. Whately's work.

Of the Doctor's discourses, it will be pronounced, we should think, unanimously, that the first is much the best. It has the great advantage of being comparatively untrod-den ground; and the principal extracts which we are about to furnish will be taken from this part of the work. The sermon opens with a brief explanation of the preacher's general design, and with some remarks upon the supposed contradiction between foreknowledge and free-will, to which we shall speedily return. The body of the discourse contains the argument, of which Mr. Dawson was the suggestor, and which is worked up in the following eloquent and nervous passages.

"If we cast our eyes on the world as it actually is, we readily perceive that the activity and energy of men is encreased by a persuasion that they have it in their power to attain certain ends—and that they never think of attempting that which they know to be impossible, or beyond their reach, or not capable of being obtained or averted by any thing they can do. To be taking measures for procuring a fertile season, or for stopping the mouth of a volcano, would be a certain proof of insanity. Men do indeed often engage in vain and chimerical undertakings, but it is under a belief of their practicability; and as soon as they discover their error they leave off. Ignorant people also will take needless pains to promote those designs which they favour, and which are going on steadily through the agency of other causes. Thus a child or a savage may exhaust his strength in endeavouring to quicken the

motion of a ship, and fancy that he is contributing something towards it; but as soon as he learns that all goes on as well without him, and that he really lends no help, he desists as a matter of course. The same thing has been pointed out repeatedly in the disquisitions of political economy; and the wisest statesmen have long ceased to apply the agency of government in a thousand cases, which formerly occupied their attention, finding that the causes in operation are quite adequate and effectual to the desired end, without their interference.

"Again, not only as in the cases we have been supposing, does a man desist from action as soon as he discovers that some superior influence *entirely* frustrates or *entirely* supersedes all his efforts, but in cases of a mixed nature, as far as this paramount influence is found to prevail, in the same *degree* does it tend to deaden the exertions of individuals placed under such a system. In those communities, for instance, where all hope of advancement is denied to a certain class, it is notorious that industry is less active, and that all exertion, mental as well as bodily, is more languid. And even when all hope of advancement is not cut off, yet when it depends not upon the merit or address of the individual, but on the caprice of a despot, how feeble comparatively and inefficient is the motive to action.

"Of the two grand motives then which actuate reasonable beings, hope and fear, the influence is always diminished in proportion to the opinion men have of the unalterable conditions under which they are placed. The nearest approach to that necessity which the laws of the material universe imply, is to be found in the laws of civil society: and if these are such as to render exertion needless or fruitless, indolence uniformly takes place of exertion, when good is before them, and languor or despondency instead of manly endeavours to avert any apprehended evil. Such is universally admitted to be the effect of our own laws for the maintenance of the poor: the motive of *fear* is almost extinguished: and on the other hand, from the absence of *hope*, the labour of slaves is well known to be less productive than that of freemen, and this, precisely in proportion to the persuasion they have, that they must always be slaves, and that no prospect of emancipation lies before them. So too in the conduct of those who are condemned to death, and to whom all the steps that lead to the final execution of their sentence assume the appearance of

inevitable necessity. What stronger instinct is there in man than the love of life, and what incredible exertions have been often made to preserve it! Yet mark the conduct of him who is doomed to perish under sentence of the law: no struggle or resistance even to avoid that at which nature shudders—but a calm submission to decrees which he is convinced must take effect, however idly he may contend against them." P. 10.

"It is contended that none of those practical evils are to be dreaded which the adversaries of fatalism regard as connected with it, because the bulk of mankind will never have leisure so far to abstract their minds as to conceive the simple truth. Habit with them will always supersede reflection; and habit is formed by successive acts, by natural instinct, by unthinking appetite, and by the example of those among whom we live, and whose modes of acting and thinking we imperceptibly adopt. And thus if even the philosophical advocate for necessity cannot avoid talking as if his will were free, and as if events were liable to be affected by it, there is no great reason to fear that with the generality of men the persuasion will ever gain an ascendancy adverse to the real interests of life.

"Now this is precisely the point to which I was desirous of leading the whole question. For if to *discover the true relations of things* be one of the proper employments of our being, if in proportion to the exercise and improvement of our intellectual faculties we come to see these things more clearly and to think of them more justly, so that our progress in this knowledge is a kind of measure of our intellectual advancement, it would follow, upon the hypothesis of fatalism, that every step we advance in knowledge we recede from utility; and that in the same proportion as we grow wiser, we become less fit and less disposed to fulfil the purposes of our being. If fatalism represent the true relations of things, the path of error is then the path of utility and of happiness: truth has a tendency to lead us away from both: and the Creator has formed us full of active powers and principles, and yet with a capacity and a disposition to draw nearer and nearer to that state, which, if we could ever actually reach it, would make all these faculties and principles implanted in us useless, and would reduce us to absolute inactivity." P. 17.

The argument is equally forcible

when it is applied to man as a moral agent. We give the summing up, which is a good specimen of the whole.

"The invention of man, when bent either upon some favourite object, or willing to vindicate his crimes, is ever busy in devising *pretended forms* of necessity to sanction a deviation from moral rectitude. And thus it is that evil of every kind public and private, cruel wars, oppressive government, unjust measures of state, dishonesty, deceit, rapine, and even murder, find a ready excuse. Men prove how valid and substantial the real plea is, by grasping thus eagerly at its shadow and mere resemblance, whenever the case will bear it. *Artificial difficulties* are misnamed *necessity*—and then, their 'poverty but not their will consents' to the most dreadful crimes. For the voice of all mankind does undoubtedly bear testimony to this rule—that in proportion as the case *approaches* to absolute necessity, in the same degree is the offence of the party extenuated, and his responsibility abated.

"Now let us suppose that, not only on some great and rare occasions, but in *all* the concerns of life, that plea could be with truth alledged, which we allow to operate as an absolution even from the greatest crimes. Must not the knowledge or the belief of such a system tend to loosen all moral restraint, to confound all duties, to deaden moral feeling, and to silence the voice of conscience? Not that we suppose these effects will ever actually be produced to any extensive degree, because delusion will never prevail long over the fixed laws of our nature—but on the supposition that the doctrine of necessity is *true*, this conclusion must needs follow in *morals*, as before it did in the case of *active principles*. The more we learn the truth of things, that is, the wiser we grow, and the more steadily we improve and exercise our reasoning powers, the more do we furnish ourselves with motives for discarding moral responsibility—and thus man is formed by his Maker, a preposterous compound, with a *conscience* that informs him of his duty, and with an *understanding* that tells him, in proportion as it is cultivated and improved, that his conscience is a mistaken guide. And it is to speculations such as these that the world gives the name of philosophical necessity!" P. 23.

"The generality of Calvinists, when charged with the *consequences* of their opinions, like the Fatalists, answer that

we ought to *address* mankind as if their doom were unsettled—as if God were willing that all should be saved—as if much depended on themselves whether they should obtain salvation or not. And when further pressed with the *inconsistency* of these opinions they reply, that such exhortations are the *appointed means* of *perseverance*. Be it so. Then they are means the efficacy of which is increased by turning our eyes away from the truth. For in proportion to the conviction we feel of the truth of the main doctrine, that is, the better we become acquainted, according to them, with the right interpretation of Scripture, and the more we meditate upon it, the weaker do these means become which are the appointed instruments of our salvation. This argument then is not a refutation, like many others, drawn from opinions opposite to theirs: it is involved in their own defence: it is admitted by themselves in the very acknowledgment they make, that we ought in practice to accommodate ourselves to the ordinary belief of mankind upon these subjects, however erroneous; or, in other words, that advancement in the knowledge of truth may obstruct men's salvation."—P. 23.

It is not easy to point out more lucid or more conclusive reasoning than this—and we cannot quit it without regretting that in another part of his subject Dr. Copleston should have recourse to less satisfactory arguments, from which many of his readers will necessarily dissent, and which will diminish the effect of the whole enquiry. We allude to those parts of the volume in which the difficulties arising out of a belief of a superintending Providence as compatible with the free will of man are considered. This question is entered upon in the commencement of the first sermon, and it forms the chief subject of the second and the third.

When Dr. Copleston informed us, in his Preface, that God's foreknowledge and man's free will are propositions separately demonstrable; that they are not *contradictory*, and yet their congruity is *inconceivable*, we took it for granted that these were the facts which he intended to demonstrate; and expect-

ed that he would shew the inutility and the danger of attempting to penetrate farther into the mystery of which he treats. This attempt has been made by several distinguished metaphysicians, and the exposure of their errors would be no unprofitable task. But this agreeable anticipation vanished when we learned that it was intended to lay considerable stress upon the various senses of the words, *certainly*, *possibility*, and *contingency*; and that Dr. Copleston proposed to shew that much of the difficulty which he was about to unravel, turns merely upon the equivocation of a word. He hopes indeed at a future time to say something farther of the use of the terms employed in abstract reasoning, "but not without the apprehension of incurring the displeasure of those who, if his speculations are well founded, will appear to have lost their time in logomachy, and to have wasted their strength in endeavouring to grasp a phantom or in fighting the air." So little benefit has been derived from the metaphysical lucubrations which set out with accusing preceding writers of logomachy, that we did not read this declaration without considerable misgivings, and we lament to say that they were justified by the result.

The only real difficulty with which Dr. Copleston's subject is embarrassed, and the only real answer of which that difficulty admits, had been admirably stated at the beginning of the Preface, and are enlarged upon with equal felicity in the second sermon. There is no novelty or discovery in either. The substance of them has been repeated again and again; and cannot be put in fewer words than those which Burnet has employed in his exposition of the seventeenth Article. "The infinite perfection of the divine mind ought to silence all objection."—"The unconceivableness of any thing supposed to be in God"

is not the slightest proof of its non-existence, or its impossibility.

This answer has been repeatedly given to the Calvinist who denies free-will, and to the Socinian who rejects fore-knowledge; it is sufficient to satisfy every reasonable mind; and the improvements upon it, and the additions to it which have been suggested from time to time, have not added to its truth or its efficacy. The refinements introduced by Locke, by Tucker, and even by Horsley, are all liable to one and the same censure. Locke mystifies and perplexes the whole subject to an extent of which there are few instances to be found in his writings. Instead of discussing the real question, is the will free? he pretends that the question is an absurd one; and that as long as men can do what they will, nothing more need be enquired into or settled. Tucker improves upon this hint; and extracts from it a complete solution of the great problem. He merely supposes that God supplies man with motives, which man is so constituted that he cannot but freely obey, and then the difficulty is not in foreknowing how a free being will act, but in explaining how any one ever came to perplex himself with so simple and obvious a circumstance!! These wonders, be it observed, are all accomplished by keeping clear of an *equivocal use of words*. Bishop Horsley cannot be accused of erring to the same extent as Locke and Tucker,—yet he speaks of the difficulty, as if he conceived that it might be got over, and explains God's foreknowledge by his acquaintance with the causes of all events, and by the certain connection of events with their causes*. The animated assertion of man's freedom, by which these declarations are followed, proves that the learned writer could not possi-

* Sermons, Vol. II. p. 117, 118.

bly have intended to advocate the cause of necessity. Yet if events are certainly connected with their causes, and these causes are ordained by God, it is no easy matter to shew that the fatalist is in the wrong. The fact is, that the attempt to explain and reconcile what is inexplicable, will baffle the talents even of a Locke, and a Horsley. There are rocks on either side, and on one or other of them the vessel splits. If we insist upon our own occasional foresight, and contend that God may foresee with infinitely greater precision, the danger to be dreaded is, that since our foresight is *never* more than probable—the sceptic will infer that God's foreknowledge is likewise uncertain, and may possibly be deceived. If we contend with the ingenious Tucker, that there is no riddle to solve, because God acts upon us by motives which he knows that we shall obey, the Calvinist instantly steps in, and says that this is necessity. The very hypothesis of Tucker is assumed by Jonathan Edwards; and constitutes the basis of the only philosophical treatise in our language to which the Christian Predestinarian now appeals. The ingenuity of Edwards is so great, that we are almost willing to overlook his sophistry; and if we are to forget what we have learned from Samuel Clarke, and admit that the mind is compelled to act by motives, as certainly as the body is impelled to move by force, we neither know how to prove that the Calvinist is in error, nor can we doubt that the phenomenon of the ass between two bundles of hay, may yet be exhibited in the lecture room of an experimental metaphysician.

If on the contrary we assert what every thinking person will acknowledge, that while we perceive and confess the full strength of a motive, we may still refuse to obey it; may shut our eyes, as Clarke

has well said, and walk at a venture down a precipice; if the last judgment of the understanding is as distinct from the actual exertion of the self-motive power, as *seeing* the way is from walking in it, then it does not follow from God's knowledge of our motives, that he must also know our actions; the veil which he has interposed between himself and his creatures, continues unrent; and the most prudent part that we can take is to confess the fact, and be silent.

It must not be supposed that we accuse Dr. Copleston of transgressing this rule. On the contrary, his second sermon admits and enforces it; and he never fails throughout his enquiry to exhibit and to recommend that sacred caution with which we ought ever to speak of the actions, and attributes of God. The larger part of his observations apply to that old and substantial answer to the Calvinistic theory, of which we have already said so much. Another considerable proportion is allotted to Archbishop Kings sermon, which may be considered as the same thing in another dress, a branch of the great argument which resolves every thing into the incomprehensible nature of the Deity. We cannot think that this branch is of the same value as the parent stock. When it talks of God being revealed to us *relatively*, it talks in a metaphysical strain, which it is very desirable to avoid; and it affords a pretext, although as Dr. Copleston has proved, an insufficient pretext, for saying that there is no certainty on any religious subject. But in spite of these blemishes the Sermon is valuable, and the recommendation and republication of it cannot fail to do good. Of the third ground on which Dr. Copleston has engaged the believers in necessity, and on which he is zealously supported by Mr. Whately, we are compelled to think that he has failed. But these

ingenious and learned writers shall speak for themselves.

"In the question concerning the *certainty* of future events, which the Stoics used to infer from the necessity of the *truth* or *falsehood* of the proposition which predicts them, in order to shew the fallacy of this argument it becomes necessary to define exactly the sense in which *truth* is used when we speak of a *true proposition*. And if it be found to mean, what all accurate writers define it to be, the agreement of a *representation* with the *thing represented*, there must be some *thing* previously existing, before this idea of truth can be entertained at all. '*Propositio vera quod res est dicit.*' The original must be antecedent to the representation. An assertion therefore respecting the future may be probable or improbable, it may be honest or deceitful, it may be prudent or rash, it may have any relation we please to the mind of the person who makes it or of him who hears it, but it can have no relation at all to a thing which *is not*. Any reasoning therefore which assumes it to bear this sense, which really does not and which in fact cannot belong to it, is illusory. It turns merely upon the equivocation of a word." Preface, p. xiv.

"You may if you please contend, that because God made every thing, therefore all things that happen are done by him. This is taking another ground for the doctrine of necessity, which will be considered presently. All I maintain now is, that the notion of God's *foreknowledge* ought not to interfere in the slightest degree with our belief in the *contingency* of events, and the *freedom* of human actions. The confusion has, I conceive, arisen chiefly from the ambiguity of the word *certainty*, used as it is even by learned writers, both in its relation to the mind which thinks, and to the object about which it is thinking*." P. vi.

"One example has already been produced in the word *certainty*, which properly relates to the *mind* which thinks, and is improperly transferred to the *object* about which it is thinking. However convenient this transference of the term may be in common life, it leads to the most erroneous conclusions in abstract reasoning: and the further adoption of a term as opposed to it, for the purpose of denoting another class of events, viz. *con-*

tingent, has contributed to fix the error. The same may be said of the term *probable*, which is frequently used as if it denoted some quality in the events themselves, whereas it is merely relative, like *certain* and *contingent*, to the human mind, and is expressive of the manner in which we stand affected by such and such objects.

"Another important example of the same kind is in the use of the words *possible*, and *impossible*. These are equally ambiguous with the others, as being applied sometimes to events themselves, and sometimes used with reference to our conceptions of them—but of these it is observable that their *primary* and proper application is to events, their *secondary* and improper to the human mind. Thus we say that a thing is possible to a man who has the *power* of doing it—and that is properly *impossible* which no power we are acquainted with can effect. But the words are also continually used to express *our sense* of the chance there is that a thing will be done. When we mean to express our firm conviction that a thing will not happen, although there are *powers* in nature competent to produce it, we call it impossible, in direct opposition to those things which we are convinced will happen, and which we call certain. And thus there are many things which in one sense are *possible*, that is, within the compass of human agency, which again according to our conviction are absolutely *impossible*. In this latter sense the terms possible and impossible are used to denote the two extremes of the scale of probability—possible being the faintest degree of probability, and that which exceeds the utmost bounds of credibility being habitually pronounced impossible. This distinction is sometimes expressed by the words *physical* and *moral* impossibility, a distinction to which I would not object, provided it be understood not as marking two *kinds* of impossibility, but merely two *senses* in which the word is employed.

"There is however a third sense in which we are apt to use the word, and which has led to much confusion in speculations of this nature, that is, when we use it for *inconsistent* or *contradictory*: and it was before observed, that in speaking of the Almighty it would be more safe as well as more decent to employ this language than the word *impossible*. The whole difficulty is then declared to lie, where it really does lie, not in the things, but in the notions we form, or in the words by which we express them: and any state-

* "See Tucker, vol. iv. chap. 26, on Free Will."

ment or description of which one part is shewn to be destructive of another is immediately admitted by every rational mind to have no meaning. In this manner I endeavoured to prove that most of those speculative difficulties which perplex men's minds, about divine prescience, providence, free-will, and the origin of evil, turn out to be disputes concerning the signification of words; one party choosing to employ the word about which the dispute turns in a sense *exclusive* of some idea which the other regards as *compatible* with it, and which the first party allows to be in itself a probable and reasonable supposition, hard to be denied or disbelieved, and which nothing but the shackles he has imposed upon himself by this arbitrary definition of a term prevents him from admitting." P. 80.

These are the principal passages in which Dr. Copleston brings forward his new explanation of the difficulties he is considering, and Mr. Whately follows it up.

"In its ordinary sense, the word 'contingent' denotes no quality in *events*, but only the relation in which they stand to our *knowledge*; thus, the same thing may be contingent to one person, and at the same time not contingent (or *certain* as it is called) to another: for instance, whether such an one was killed or not in the last battle that was fought in India, may be a contingency to his friends in England, but is a certainty to those on the spot. The admirable reasoning therefore of Dr. King does not apply in this case: not because contingency *implies*, with us, ignorance of the event, (for that alone would not be a sufficient ground of exception,) but because it implies *nothing else*: that is the *whole* meaning of the word: so that it is a contradiction in terms to speak of the same thing as *known*, and as *contingent*, at the *same* time, to the *same* being; though that may be contingent to *us*, which is known to *God*." P. 14.

"First, the original meaning of the word necessity appears to have been, 'an intimate connection,' or 'conjunction;' as is indicated both by its etymology, as if from 'neceto,' and by the use of 'necessitudo,' and 'necessarius,' to denote close intimacy. Hence, food is called 'necessary' to life, because of the connection between the two; life never continues *without*, that is, *separately*, from food. And on the same principle we speak of the

'necessity' of a *cause* to its *effect**. Death, again, is a matter of 'necessity' to man, because no man continues exempt from it. The truth of a conclusion follows 'necessarily' from the premises, because their truth does not exist *separately* from that of the conclusion†; they are never found to be true without its being true also.

"It being a *constant* connexion that is expressed by 'necessary,' the word is commonly used, in *general assertions*, as nearly equivalent to 'universal;' and 'not-necessary,' to occasional: for instance, a rupture of the spinal marrow 'necessarily' occasions death; (that is, in *all* cases; the inhabitants of hot countries are not necessarily negroes, (that is, *not universally*.) In this way, 'necessary,' and 'not-necessary,' may, with propriety, be applied to any *class* of things, in any *general* proposition: but neither of them can be thus applied to *individual* events; the assertions respecting which, being what logicians call *singular* propositions, cannot be *more or less general*, nor, consequently, can need or admit of any such limitation, as is expressed by 'not-necessary.' It would be perfectly unmeaning to say of any 'singular' proposition, (for instance, the banishment of Buonaparte,) that it is true *without any exception*, or that it *admits of exception*. The words 'necessary' and 'not-necessary,' therefore, when applied to individual cases, must (if not wholly unmeaning) be employed with some different view: thus we say, 'the confinement of Buonaparte is "necessary,"' namely 'to the peace of Europe.'

"Secondly, our *attention* being most called to the connexion of such things as we may in vain wish or endeavour to separate, the word 'necessary' hence comes to be *limited*, and *especially* applied to

* "That we are unable to perceive any *efficacy* in what are called 'physical causes,' to produce their respective effects, and that all we do perceive (and consequently all we really indicate, in these cases, by the word causation) is a constant *conjunction*—a connection in point of time and place, is the doctrine not of Hume alone, (who has deduced illogical and mischievous conclusions from it,) but also of Barrow, and Butler, as well as D. Stewart."

† "In this case 'necessity' is opposed to a *contradiction* and absurdity; in the former instances, to a *violation of the order of nature*.

cases of *compulsion*; to events which take place either against one's will, or, at least, independent of it; to things, in short, which we have no *power* to prevent if we would, or to prevent, without submitting to a worse alternative*. Hence we speak more especially of the necessity of death, because all animals *avoid* it as long as they are able; and of the necessity of throwing over goods in a storm, because it is what we are averse to in itself, and though we might refuse to do it, we could not, without incurring shipwreck. In this sense it is that necessity is pleaded, and allowed, as an *excuse* for doing what would otherwise be blameable. But in the primitive and wider sense of the word, it may be applied to cases where there is no *compulsion*, nor opposition to the will: for the close connexion, above spoken of, exists between the will of any agent and that which is conformable to his will: thus foreign luxuries are 'necessary' for *gratification* to him who delights in them: and the word is often thus employed; only that, in this case, it is proper, in order to avoid mistake, to state *for what* they are necessary: they are not called simply 'necessary,' (which would imply that they were so in the secondary and more limited sense, which has been last mentioned, that is, independently of our will and choice,) but 'necessary *for* so and so." P. 83.

"Thirdly, There is also another use of the word 'necessary' and of those connected with it: for, as it has been above remarked that our *attention* is especially *called* to those connections which we may vainly endeavour to *destroy*, so our attention is likewise particularly called to those connections which we *understand*, or at least are *aware of*. And since of

two things connected together, if the one which is the hypothesis or antecedent be given, the consequent is also given, it follows that *we know*, or are *certain* of, the consequent, when we know the hypothesis: and hence arises the confusion of *certainly* with 'necessity;' the former of which belongs properly to our own *minds*, and is thence, in a transferred sense, applied to the *objects* themselves. When we know, first, the connexion between two things, (which is properly necessity,) and, secondly, the existence of one of them, we thence come to know 'certainly,' that is, without any room for doubt, the existence of the other: which we sometimes therefore call 'certain,' sometimes 'necessary:' for instance, we say, such a district is 'necessarily,' or is 'certainly,' overflowed; because *we* are certain, first, that such a river has risen so many feet, and, secondly, that that rise is connected with the overflowing of the district in question." P. 87.

With the assistance of these simple distinctions, Mr. Whately expects to expose and silence the unfortunate *logomachist*, and "to explain the confused notion of many of the advocates for the system of necessity; and of many of its opponents also." Would it not be as well if he were to look at home, before he again ventures to accuse such men as Samuel Clarke, and Archbishop King, * Bishop Law, and

ther of these two senses is, properly speaking, opposed to the primary sense of 'necessary,' but rather they are *limitations* of it."

* Mr. Whately finds great fault with one of Law's *Notes on the Origin of Evil*, chap. 5. sect. 1. subs. 5. note s. The note does not deserve the censure which is passed upon it; and moreover it is the composition not of Law but of King. (See *Preface to 4th Edition*, p. xiv.) This is a *contingency*, for although it has certainly come to pass, Mr. Whately does not know it!

From this note Mr. Whately may also learn, that the discovery which he attributes to Mr. Dugald Stewart, viz. of that of the necessity of mathematical truths consisting merely in conformity to the terms of the hypothesis, was well known to Archbishop King. "One kind of necessity is, when a proposition affirming a thing to be, includes such a necessity that it should be,

"There are several modifications of meaning comprehended under this first head, of which I am now speaking; but there is no need to enter into any full discussion of these beyond what concerns the main object proposed."

* Hence ἀναγκαῖον, which is literally 'necessary,' is often so used as to be nearly equivalent to 'unpleasant,' or 'disadvantageous.'"

† "As 'necessary' in the sense just above noticed, is opposed to 'voluntary,' so in the sense I am now speaking of it is opposed to 'accidental' or 'contingent;' (words which, as has been formerly remarked, do not denote any quality in events themselves, but only the relation in which they stand to *our knowledge*;) nei-

Dr. Paley, of mistaking words for things? We shall endeavour to prove the affirmative of this question.

The great stress of Dr. Copleston's and Mr. Whately's argument rests upon the impropriety of saying, that a future event is certain. As we are very unwilling to dispute about words, we can have no objection to give it up, provided they will furnish us with a better. For if their object is not merely to improve our phraseology, but to take away an idea which that phraseology has been accustomed to denote, we beg leave to demur to the proposal. When the primitive Christians said, that the destruction of Jerusalem, a future event, was certain; or when modern Christians say, that the end of the world (a future event) will certainly come, the meaning of the speakers was and is, that they contemplate these events as *fixed*. And if Dr. Copleston wishes to substitute the term for *certain*, we think he ought to be indulged in his fancy. It is true Bp. Horsley did venture to speak of the certainty of things to come; and Tucker, a great authority with our authors, in the famous 26th chapter, which they refer to continually, answers the fatalists, p. 198, by saying, that God's knowledge does not make an event certain, but finds it so; and "his discovery did not make the certainty, but presup-

poses it; for the thing was certain before, though he did not know it."

These may be considered as good authorities for the word; yet shall it be given up and altered, if that will suffice. We doubt, however, whether the Calvinist will be convinced by the change. He contends, that what God certainly foreknows, cannot fail to come to pass; and he says, that whether you speak of such a future event as certain, or as fixed, or as predetermined, or settled, or inevitable, the result is just the same. He uses these words as relative not to God but to the event; and the only argument which we can conceive for refusing him the liberty of so doing, is that which was alluded to by the Doctor in his preface, viz. that there can be no relation to a thing that is not; and that therefore a future (i.e. a non-existent) event, can neither be fixed, or settled, or inevitable. This is a mere sophism. All the world knows, that we talk and think and reason of things that are not; and the imaginary being, or circumstance, or event, has its imaginary modes, relations, and qualities. The entire science of mathematics is founded upon reasonings which relate to things that are not: viz. to the imaginary point, that has neither parts nor magnitude; to the line, that has neither breadth nor depth; to the surface which is thinner than any that can be conceived. And unless Dr. Copleston declares, that all these reasonings are absurd, how can he deny us the privilege of saying, that an event which has been predicted by God shall assuredly and certainly be done.

But the prediction, or the foreknowledge, does not make the certainty. This is true; because the foreknowledge is ascribed to a mind and a nature which we are utterly at a loss to conceive; and, therefore, we are not at liberty to assert, that any thing is impossible to it. Man, strictly speaking, never

as to make it a contradiction to say it might not be; the causes that produce it being necessary." The same despised note says, "I know very well men do many things willingly as beasts eat their food; and that some call this liberty and contingency, but they might as well call it an elephant or a horse," &c. &c. The passage is a complete answer, not only to Leibnitz and Hobbs, against whom it was directed, but to Jonathan Edwards, who maintains that we are free, because we are governed by motive; and to Tucker, who, for the same reason, thinks that there is no difficulty in reconciling foreknowledge and freewill.

does foreknow ; he can only infer, expect, and guess ; none of which have the slightest appearance of being inconsistent with the contingency of future events. If a man could be absolutely certain, that contingency would cease ; but it is not the same when we transfer the reasoning to God, because his thoughts are not as our thoughts ; and when he declares that we are free, and that still He foreknows, the inference is, that it comes to pass in some manner far beyond our ability to comprehend. Dr. Copleston attributes the difficulty (p. 7,) to the ambiguity of words ; we attribute it to the weakness of the faculties which we possess ; and we are quite at a loss to understand how the difference arose. We can hardly think that Dr. Copleston would suffer himself to be led away by the desire of saying something new upon a hacknied subject ; and yet this is all that he has effected or can effect by his *distinctions*. Common men will never be satisfied with such unpalatable food. They cannot talk of *relations*, and *qualities* ; they know not whether they use a word in its primary or secondary sense ; they do not care one farthing about its etymology, or its derivatives. But they know what they mean by it, quite as well as philosophers ; and he who assures them to the contrary will be laughed at for his pains. We think that we cannot have mistaken the Provost's meaning ; yet unless we have, he is guilty of this extravagance, and imagines that it enables him to clear up all difficulty and doubt. He does not even appear to be consistent with himself, since he adopts those arguments which say, that the subject can only be explained by referring it to God's unknown and infinite nature, and then tells us, that " these speculative difficulties about prescience, providence, free-will, and the origin of evil, turn out to be disputes about the significations of words."

If he had confided in this discovery, all the rest might have been spared. If he can complete and demonstrate it, he will convict all his predecessors of logomachy. For our own parts we shall submit, and kiss the rod. We shall think it no dishonour to be chastised by the hand of a Copleston ; and as our punishment will be shared among all the writers on the Calvinistic controversy, whose works have seen the light, we shall console ourselves by reflecting upon the number and respectability of our fellow-sufferers. In the mean time we venture very humbly to observe, that while in controversy there are logomachists, who will grieve over the termination of their disputes in philology, also there are critics, who delight in a distinction without a difference, and are never better pleased than when they cheat themselves and their readers by putting a new signification upon an old word.

We should be sorry to see the name of Mr. Whately inscribed upon such a list ; but there can be no doubt that he is a candidate for the situation, and bids fair for success. The extracts already submitted to the attention of our readers, are admirable specimens of neology. First, *contingency* means ignorance of the event, and nothing more. Secondly, the word *necessity* has three significations, *universal*, *compulsory*, and *certain*. Thirdly, *causation* means a *constant conjunction*, a connection as it appears from a passage which we have not quoted *in point of time and place*. Fourthly, *impossible* denotes, 1st. " *restraint*, or absence of power ;" and 2dly. " the absence of all room for doubt, or as we often express it of all chance and contingency." The last words prove, that Mr. Whately is aware of the ordinary meaning of the word *contingency*—*we often employ* it as synonymous with a chance. Johnson accordingly defines it, " the quality of being for-

tuitous, accidental possibility :” and the passages which he cites, prove the accuracy of his explanation. What authority then has Mr. Whately for his most unqualified assertion, that “contingency implies ignorance of the event, and nothing else.” Was it ever used in that sense by a classical English writer? If not, how does he suppose that the meaning of words is to be ascertained? In expounding *necessity* he lays great stress upon its derivation. But this shield will not protect him in the instance now before us. The various senses through which the word has passed are, *touching*, *arriving at*, *happening*, and *being accidental*. There is no link deficient, and there is no hole or corner at which “ignorance of the event” could have crept in. Mr. Whately says, that a death that has taken place in India is a contingency with us until the news reaches England. Our answer is, that this use of the word is unknown and unauthorised, and that to employ it as he recommends would be to speak bad English. Our common gamblers and sharpers might give him a useful lesson upon the real meaning of the word. They would not presume to argue with him on a question of criticism or metaphysics; but they would say, that they had learned their native tongue, and were accustomed to think with sufficient closeness where their interest was at stake. Their idea of contingency, they would add, was that of something which might or might not happen; and that as soon as an event had taken place, they considered it as determined and unalterable. They would illustrate their meaning by saying, that a bet upon a horse-race was not considered binding if it was made after the race was run, because the bet was upon the hazard, and as soon as that was over the contingency ceased. Mr. Whately might reply, that they were under a mistake,

that they only intended to say, that the event was unknown. But they would not readily allow that their intention could be more accurately known to him than to themselves; and we conceive that their reluctance would be generally applauded.

We come next to *necessity*; and the derivation to which, in the instance of contingency, he did not advert, is here his principal ally. The original sense of it, he pronounces to be an intimate connection, because it is derived from *necto*, and because *necessarius* means an intimate friend. This would be sufficiently plausible if philosophy had first been taught at Rome; but the Latins borrowed every idea from Greece, where *αναγκη* signified necessity, and *αναγκαιος* an intimate acquaintance, but where the etymology had nothing to do with *connection*. Aristotle derives *αναγκαιος* from *ακινητος*, others from *ανασσω* and *αγω*. At all events, therefore, the Greeks did not get their idea of necessity from connection and conjunction; and their idea, however got, was transferred in the most servile manner into the Latin tongue, and the word which was chosen to denote it may be derived from *nex*, with much greater probability, than from *necto*. Consequently Mr. Whately's argument is unsound at the bottom. The proper sense of *necessary*, and all its synonyms, is not universal, but fixed, or unalterable.

—— ‘Necessity and chance
Approach not me, and what I will is fate.’

When the word is used to signify what is advantageous for us, or what is highly probable, it is used improperly, or at best figuratively; and it would be every whit as useful, and every whit as true, to say, that when Milton talked of chance, he meant variety; and that when he talked of fate he meant *words*, as to say that we have no other proper meaning when we use the term

necessity, than that which arises from the contemplation of connected events.

The use which is to be made of these unnecessary refinements will appear from the following passage.

"Being thus accustomed to apply to those things especially the word 'necessary,' which we *know* to be connected with and dependent on such others as we know to exist, we thus come to fancy a sort of coincidence between 'necessity' and 'knowledge': for instance, we say that a loaded die *must necessarily* turn up one particular side; but that an unloaded one does not necessarily fall on one side rather than another: the one die therefore has turned up, suppose, a six, necessarily; the other, *accidentally*.

"In reality, however, the only difference (as far as concerns the present question is *relative to our knowledge*: the fall of the latter die being connected with, and dependent on, the various impulses it received in the box, &c. as much as that of the other, with the gravitation of the weight it was loaded with; only the operation of the one influence was, or might be, *known* to us; the other could not. Let it be borne in mind therefore, that when we say the cast of this die was not necessary, we only mean in fact (if we attach any precise meaning to our words) that we do not know *why* it was necessary; that is, do not fully know the operation of the causes which produced it; for scarce any one would say it happened without any cause at all; and should he explain his meaning in saying this to be, that *if* the box had been shaken in some other way, the cast might have been different; the answer is, that, on that principle, the other is not to be called necessary neither; since *if* the other die had not been loaded, or had been loaded differently, the cast of that also would have been different. In neither case could the result have been other than it was, *supposing all the circumstances connected with it to remain the same*. When indeed we speak of events in which man's agency is concerned, as not necessary, and say that they *might* have happened otherwise, we sometimes mean that the agent acted not from *compulsion*, but willingly, and had it in his power to act otherwise; sometimes, again, that we do not know, or did not know beforehand, what the compulsion was, or under what inducements he acted.

"The word 'necessary' then is used, first, sometimes to denote the universa-

lity or constancy of the connection between any two things, and consequently, in any *general* assertion, to imply merely that what we say is true without any exception or qualification: secondly, sometimes to denote *compulsion*, or independence of our will: thirdly, sometimes to denote our *knowledge* respecting the matter in question, and our having no room for doubt about it. P. 88.

This argument is intended "as a clue to explain the confused notions of many of the advocates for the system of necessity, and many of its opponents." Admitting it to be true as far it goes, it proves nothing to the purpose, unless we suppose that men are influenced by motives as certainly and inevitably, as a die by its load. An absurdity which Clarke has sufficiently exposed, and which we certainly flattered ourselves that he had exploded. But the argument is sophistical, even as far as it relates to the dicer and his die. For if he has been informed that a sharper has loaded the die, he will say and may be sure that *some one side* will inevitably turn up. He may have no knowledge, which side it will be; but he is sure that it will and must be a particular side, and can be no other. And, therefore, he says, it is necessary; and it is necessary, not from his knowledge, for then it would not have been necessary if he had not known it, but from the existence of an adequate cause which will infallibly produce it. On the other hand, if we are sure that the die is unloaded, we affirm that any side may turn up. Not that we suppose that the event will not be the necessary result of the laws of matter and motion, or that it will not depend upon the situation of the die and the box, or our hand and the table, &c. But these circumstances are all unfixed; not merely unknown but accidental; we may change the position the moment before we throw, and a change in the result must ensue. It is the *fixedness*, therefore, of the circumstances which

makes the fall of the loaded die necessary; and the *mutability* of the circumstances which makes the fall of the unloaded die fortuitous; and the knowledge or ignorance of the player has nothing at all to do with it. If a dicer, like a juggler, could throw an ace at his pleasure (and some tricks of this kind have been detected) the turn up of the ace would be necessary, and the dicer would be horse-whipped for a cheat; though the company did not know his trick, and therefore, according to Mr. Whately, they ought to consider the event as contingent. This is a manifest *reductio ad absurdum*.

But this error is out done by the definitions of cause and effect. "We cannot perceive any efficacy in what are called 'physical causes' to produce their respective effects." If this means that we do not know *how* impulse produces motion, or gravity occasions bodies to fall, or our will enables us to extend an arm or a leg, it is quite true. But the inference, "that all we do perceive (and consequently all we really indicate in these cases by the word 'causation') is a constant conjunction," is a very false and a very dangerous conclusion. As to its being found in Barrow and Butler, until the passages are pointed out to us, we shall beg leave to doubt the fact. Hume has certainly deduced mischievous consequences from it; but that they are illogical has never yet been proved. The real error is in the assumption—his subsequent reasoning is unanswerable. He is not entitled however to the sole honour of the sophism; for Mr. Coleridge has detected the same subtlety in one of the old schoolmen, and Jonathan Edwards, as acute and as sophistical as Hume, has said that "he sometimes uses the word *cause*, in his enquiry, to signify any *antecedent* with which a consequent event is so connected, that it truly belongs to the reason why the proposition which affirms that event is true, whether it has

any positive influence or not*." It will be seen that this is a mitigated *Humism*; but Edwards did not require to call forth the full powers of the medicine, his object merely being to establish Christian fatalism. Hume aimed at atheism and a true atheistic necessity, and therefore he administered the dose in its most concentrated shape.

It is not wonderful that Edwards and Hume should go astray—they were bent upon establishing doctrines against which common sense revolts—and they did not act inconsistently in assuming absurdities, and sophisms. But we confess we are astonished, and not less astonished than grieved, at finding that a learned, able, and orthodox clergyman and college tutor should be seduced into similar errors. The sentence alluded to, short as it is, contains more weak points than one. "All that we perceive is the constant connection," this though not strictly† true may pass. But Mr.

* Edwards on Free Will, Part II. Sect. 3. Many of our readers may not be aware of the extent to which good Jonathan carried his triumph. His conclusion contains the following challenge. "And really all the Arminians on earth might be challenged *without arrogance or vanity*, to make these principles of theirs wherein they mainly differ from their fathers, whom they so much despise, consistent with common sense; yea, and perhaps to produce any doctrine ever embraced by the blindest bigot of the Church of Rome, or the most ignorant Mussulman, or extravagant enthusiast, that might be reduced to more demonstrable inconsistencies, and repugnances to common sense and to themselves." The able man who arrives at this notable conclusion sets out with saying, that the desire is the same as the will; and proceeds to confound an antecedent with a cause. The difference between the former is no less than that between having a good appetite, and ordering a handsome dinner. Of the latter we speak below.

† If it were strictly true the consequence would be that all events thus connected, must be causes and effects. For instance, the ringing of a college bell, would be the

Whately adds, "consequently all that we really indicate by the word causation, is &c." Can a word then indicate nothing but the perceptions of sense? Are there no inferences made by the mind, no suppositions, no conceptions, which a word can signify and express? Our notion of causation arises briefly thus—the sense perceives *connection*: the understanding infers production; and the word causation indicates both. This is just as clear, as that no one except Mr. Whately would say that he was contingent, when he meant that he was ignorant;—and it is no use to argue farther about the meaning of a word which every body uses, and every body understands, and which nobody will believe to have changed its signification out of compliment to Edwards, to Hume, or even to Stewart.

Nor can it be said that Mr. Whately's definitions lead to no practical bad consequences—if they were merely ingenious whims they would not have required the consideration that has now been bestowed upon them. Unhappily they produce a visible and mischievous effect upon his other opinions.

"A man will often say indeed that he 'cannot help' doing so and so, though he knows it is wrong: but this is a figurative expression; and it is of great importance in practice, steadily to bear in mind that it is so; for no man is blamed or punished (nor could be, to any purpose) for doing what he, literally, cannot help; whereas, when he follows his inclination in doing what he knows to be wrong, the common sense of all mankind has decided, and proved by experience, that it is just, or at least expedient, to punish him. That 'necessity' can alone be pleaded as a justification, in which a man acts *against* his will." P. 96.

Why is the justice of punishing a malefactor qualified in this passage by the phrase 'or at least expedient?'

cause why the fellows go to dinner or to prayers, for these events are constantly connected both in time and place.

REMEMBRANCE, No. 34.

Because upon his own principles Mr. Whately cannot prove that it is just. If the malefactor could have acted otherwise, if he could have resisted his inclinations, his punishment is just. If not, if as Tucker and his followers, and as Edwards also and the Calvinists maintain, motives must always produce their effect, as certainly as the heavier weight pulls down the scale, punishment can only be justified upon the tyrant's plea; its expedience must be resorted to, for justice is out of the question. Necessity, as resulting from human co-action, implies acting against our will; but where super-human agents are under consideration, it is requisite to settle whether the will itself be free. For if it be not, we are as much enchained by the slavery resulting from an inevitable compliance with motives, as by the dungeons and manacles of the Inquisition. How little is really known of Fatalism or Calvinism, by one who imagines that they can be silenced by such arguments as these!

"When however I say that the doctrine is harmless, I mean only to those who can keep their minds stedfastly fixed on this its true interpretation; for it is very liable to be misapprehended; and the errors thus produced are most mischievous. The generality of men, if told that any thing takes place necessarily, and could not have been otherwise, will be apt to consider this necessity as independent of the very circumstances which gave rise to it; and to lose sight of the equal necessity of these. Thus it is that Mahomet seems to have taught predestination to his followers; and in this sense, it appears, on some occasions they practically adhere to it; as, for instance, in neglecting to take precautions against the plague. Thus also the vulgar among us will be apt to say, 'If God foresees I shall be saved, I shall be, live how I may; if, that I shall not be saved, nothing I can do will avail.' They will often be unable to perceive that there is just the same connection between the conditions and the end, between our own efforts and our salvation, as there would have been, had no being existed who could foresee either. It is better therefore to tell them that their salvation is *contin-*

gent; which is no deceit; for in fact it is so, in the only sense in which any thing can be contingent; that is, we are ignorant respecting our final doom, except so far that we know it rests with each man to accept the offers made, or to reject them, and that each will fare accordingly." P. 100.

Better to tell the vulgar that their salvation is contingent!!! For although in *reality* it is no such thing, yet since they will understand the word in its old sense, they will act as if their salvation were really at stake; and since as in the new sense, the proposition is true, the good folks will have no reason to complain of being deceived! We are happy to say that there is no second passage in Mr. Whately's volume so erroneous or so mischievous as this; and we heartily wish that this had never seen the light. Mr. Daniel Wilson himself does not *wholly conceal* what he thinks that God has commanded him to teach always and openly. And the lame and impotent conclusion of Mr. Whately's wire drawn arguments is, that every thing is fixed and fated, but that the wise must be snug, and keep their own secret—that we must talk to the vulgar of contingencies, but need not believe in them ourselves. We are furnished with a very adequate description of the argument that is thus brought to a close in the following severe passage.

"The arguments and systems which have been thus reared, remind one of the fog-banks, which at sea so often delude the anxious mariner; he fancies himself within view of new coasts, with promontories, and bays, and mountains distinctly discernible; but a nearer approach, and a more steady observation, prove the whole to be but an unsubstantial vapour, ready to melt away into air, and vanish for ever." P. 94.

It would be unjust to conclude our remarks without adverting to the second Appendix; wherein, as well as in several parts of that on which we have already commented,

are contained many just and useful observations, at variance with the errors which disfigure the passages that have been considered, but in themselves both true and weighty. A large portion of the second Appendix is devoted to an enquiry into the merits of Archbishop King's best known work, the *Essay on the Origin of Evil*. And the fallacy which prevents that Essay from accomplishing its object is briefly and neatly pointed out. We agree with Mr. Whately also in what he observes respecting the mischief of such unsuccessful attempts. The doubting mind turns to them in the full expectation of being set at rest; and the higher the author's reputation the more sanguine is the reader's hope. If he finds himself disappointed, he will seldom rest satisfied with throwing aside the volume, and pronouncing it ineffectual and inconclusive—but he will think that what has not been accomplished by such an eminent theologian, is impossible; and that Christianity is encumbered with unsurmountable difficulties. How strange it is that our acute and learned annotator should fail to observe that the same remark will apply to his own endeavours to explain predestination and free-will. The Calvinist, or the calvinistically-inclined, will seldom if ever admit that they have succeeded. Mr. Whately's failure will excite prejudices against older and better expositions, and the errors which he designed to eradicate will be nourished and perpetuated by his hand. While we read the practical parts of his notes and appendices, we feel convinced that we are listening to a humble Christian, who is far enough from presuming to be wise above what is written,—but when theory, and etymology, and derivative significations step in, the straight path is forsaken, and we cannot advance a step. Why should we be compelled to give the quotations and the answers which have been already sub-

mitted to the reader, in the Review of a pamphlet on Predestination, which concludes with such a sentence as the following.

"Lastly, let the preachers of the Gospel bear in mind that the object of that Gospel is not to explain the causes of moral evil, but to remedy its effects. Let them, after being satisfied that the Scriptures are the word of God, seek for such instruction respecting his nature and his dealings with man, as *they* afford *. Let them remember, themselves, and sedulously warn their flocks, that it was the craving after FORBIDDEN KNOWLEDGE which expelled our first parents from Paradise; a temptation which still besets their posterity. Let them remember, that though Scripture invites enquiry into questions within the reach of our faculties, (for our Lord bids the Jews 'search the Scriptures,' to ascertain whether He were indeed the foretold Messiah,) it demands faith, implicit faith, in mysteries which it does not attempt to clear up; and insists on faith as the fundamental point of religion. Let them shun those therefore who profess, by simplifying and explaining these mysteries, to make faith *easy*, and thus, in effect, to destroy the very nature of it, considered as a *duty*; for there is surely no virtue in assenting to Euclid's propositions, or any thing else which can be satisfactorily and clearly demonstrated to the understanding. Such men are in truth labouring to widen the 'straight gate,' that they may the more readily and agreeably enter in at it; and are guilty of much the same fault with those who turn aside from it in disgust; the latter will not believe what they find it impossible to explain; the former are resolved to explain what they find themselves compelled to believe.

"But let the humble and faithful ministers of Christ not seek 'to be wise above that which is written,' nor rashly un-

dertake 'to justify the ways of God to man,' nor give explanations which may raise pernicious doubts in the mind of one who perceives their futility: but leaving presumptuous metaphysicians to bewilder themselves in inquiries beyond the reach of our present faculties, let them teach their flocks that 'the secret things belong unto the Lord their God, but the things that are revealed belong unto them and to their children for ever, that they may do all the words of this law.'" P. 125.

As the result of this long article, we would only request the impartial reader to compare the effects of the Calvinistic and the Anti-calvinistic hypothesis. The Predestinarian professes to have no object so much at heart as the promotion of God's glory; and supposes that absolute decrees are more consistent with the divine Majesty than conditional foreknowledge and free-will. But which is the nobler and more exalted idea of the Deity; that like man He can only certainly foreknow what is inevitable, or that by some inconceivable perfection of the uncreated mind, it can foresee even contingent events? That He can only govern his world by fastening causes to their effects, and thus subjecting his rational and responsible creatures to a concealed but virtual necessity; or that he gives them full permission to will and to act as they please, to hearken or to disregard, to be obedient or to rebel, to accept assistance, or to reject it, and yet by his Almighty power overrules these free-agents in such a manner that they infallibly accomplish his purposes? Which is the easier and more natural picture of perfect justice, truth, and goodness; that of a Being who invites us to perform what is impossible, and then punishes us for rejecting his offer, or that of one who never speaks to us in equivocal language, but gives what he has promised, and gives it universally and always? The questions answer themselves. In the field of reason and philosophy the Calvinist can make no stand. A few hard expressions

* "Let us keep to Scripture: and Scripture so understood will never lead us beyond our depth. It is only by going out of Scripture, by building theories of our own upon subjects of which we must have an imperfect knowledge, that such apparent contradictions are produced. If we set up these notions of our own as the standard of faith, and require a peremptory assent to all the inferences which appear to flow from them, we quit the true, the revealed God, and betake ourselves to the idols of our own brain." Copleston, p. 141.

scattered over a plain and intelligible volume, are the only support of his creed. And upon the strength of them he is ready to contend for that fatal necessity which leads straight to Atheism; ready to admit that Christianity is at variance with consciousness and common sense, ready to throw discredit upon all our holy mysteries, and to furnish the enemies of inspiration with the surest means of counter-acting it. We do not question the sincerity from which this conduct proceeds, but we do question the judgment, the humility, and the wisdom.

A View of the Principles and Forms of the Church of Scotland as by Law established, addressed to the Presbyterian Congregation of St. John, New Brunswick. By George Burns, D.D. Minister of St. Andrew's Church, in the City of St. John. 1817.

Remarks on Dr. Burns's View of the Principles and Forms of the Presbyterian Kirk as by Law established in Scotland. By the Rev. James Milne, Fredericton, New Brunswick. 1818.

Letter addressed to the Rev. James Milne, A.M. in consequence of his Remarks on Dr. Burns's View of the Principles and Forms of the Church of Scotland, as by Law established. By the Author of that Work. 1818.

THE state of religion in the colonies of Great Britain is a topic of painful and melancholy reflection. The wide extent of our colonial possessions affords a singular opportunity, if it has not been providentially designed for the express purpose, of settling in foreign parts the doctrine and worship of the Christian Church in its best and most efficient form. It cannot be denied, that this important office has been neglected, and while no adequate attempts have been made to intro-

duce the pure faith and discipline of the Church of England, the necessity of the case has palliated the intrusion of more questionable forms of Christianity, and every variety of sectarian prejudice has been tolerated and cherished, and approved. Before the dismemberment of our transatlantic empire, the office of a bishop was unknown in America, and after the declaration of American Independence, the episcopacy was not continued without considerable difficulty and delay. Consecration however was at length obtained, both from the English and Scotch bishops, and the Episcopal Church in America now flourishes in the midst of sectarianism, infidelity, and indifference under the able superintendence of its own bishops. In the West Indies there is no bishop, and the rites of an Episcopal Church are but partially and imperfectly administered: and the proceedings of the Bishop of Calcutta, which promise by their consolidating energy to realize the best hopes of those, in whose judicious zeal the Indian episcopate originated, leave too much room to regret, the long delay of this measure, which in real importance and use surpasses all the ecclesiastical proceedings of modern times.

Indifference to Christian truth, and more especially to its forms, may generally be expected in the mixed population of a foreign settlement, whose absence from their proper home is occasioned by motives in which religion has no concern, and frequently commences at a period of life when religion has obtained but little influence on the understanding. Under such circumstances, men might be brought to conform with any one order of religion, but they are perplexed and unable to decide, if they have the choice of more than one. Some will withdraw themselves from every congregation, and others as readily attach themselves to any which may open its doors to receive them: but

if after a lapse of time, a ministry claiming a purer origin and a higher authority, should offer itself to their attention, too many will be disposed to resist its claims, and oppose its establishment. If it is not necessary, why is it offered! And if it is necessary, why was it not offered at an earlier period? These will be the obvious questions of those who have grown up in long ignorance of the true nature of ecclesiastical polity, and in inattention to the forms of public worship: and what will not be the jealousies of those, whose minds have been imbued with different opinions, whose affections have been engaged to other pastors and teachers, and who have been armed with prejudices against the Church, which is the last to solicit their attention. The feelings of those, in whose minds any traces of religion have been retained are rendered hostile to episcopacy, while others who think lightly of religion have pleasure in observing the antipathies of those who call themselves Christians, and the surrounding heathen, doubting first of the form of Christianity, which they ought to embrace, are led to doubt, whether it is necessary to embrace any, and whether all may not be disputed and rejected. In this respect the Romish Church has an advantage above all Protestant Churches: she has but one mode of faith to recommend, and in her sedulous policy she provides, that if no choice be granted, no dispute shall be excited, and no want shall be felt.

These reflections have been called forth by a perusal of the pamphlets, of which the titles are prefixed, and which were published in the State of New Brunswick. The "minister of St. Andrew's church, in the city of St. John," upon his arrival in the province, appears to have been desirous of instructing the Presbyterian congregations in the principles and forms of the Church of Scotland as by law esta-

blished. The desire was natural; the object was important, and not liable to exception, and it would be well if the rule of faith and discipline subscribed by any dissenting congregation could be distinctly exhibited to the members of that congregation, and the public at large. It would then be known what the sectaries do and do not profess to believe: the path of the controversialist would be levelled, and the means of protection and precaution be rendered more easy and more efficient. The method which Dr. Burns pursued was to address his hearers from the pulpit, and after some revision to commit his sentiments to the press. This method was as unexceptionable as the ostensible purpose and design; but it is not easy to maintain one set of religious opinions, without reflecting, or seeming to reflect upon those which are opposed to them; and it is certainly not possible to take a plausible view of the grounds of Presbyterianism, without some unfounded insinuations against the sounder arguments of episcopacy. Dr. Burns's attempt therefore challenged the notice of Mr. Milne, the Episcopal minister and missionary at Fredericton, who, with an extent and accuracy of information, which that remote station could hardly be expected, refuted various misrepresentations of the principles and history of episcopacy, by which Dr. Burns had laboured to sustain the cause of Presbyterian purity. This provoked a rejoinder from Dr. Burns, and called into action various passions, which the general temper of his original argument had not betrayed, and when he could not defend his positions, or refute the reasonings of his adversary, he became angry, and threatened if he had the means of reference to show the force of an attack upon episcopacy, and gave utterance to various exceptions against the Church of England, for which he professed to entertain profound and unqua-

lified respect. Mr. Milne adhered to his resolution of making no reply, and perhaps a reply was not necessary, if there were none in the colony, by whom the last word would not be judged the best argument in the controversy. It is natural to suppose, that many would be gratified with a controversy, of the importance of which they could form no just conception, and in the results of which they had no interest or concern, but the progress of which they would attach themselves to the different parties in the dispute, until the pretence of organizing one congregation, threw the whole religion of the province into distraction and confusion. We have the happiness of believing that the irritation has subsided, and that tranquillity has been restored.

It is far from our intention to disturb this tranquillity, nor is it necessary to cross the Atlantic in pursuit of controversy, or to enlarge the stores of pure theology: but the cause of episcopacy is every where interesting, and a cursory attention to this distant controversy may show by what means the foundations of prelacy are undermined, and give an insight into the state of religion in our colonies, and into the opinions which foreigners and colonists entertain of the ecclesiastical policy which is pursued in the remote possessions and dependencies of the empire.

In former times it was the common argument of the Dissenters at home, that the Church of England was but partially reformed, and they justified their separation on the pretence that the Church of England differed from other reformed Churches, and held not what they conceived to be the truth. A more specious argument has arisen of late, and the Dissenter invites proselytes to the conventicle, not on the ground of any difference, but on the more delusive plea, that *it is all the same*, that there is no difference, and that all the various forms

of religion will end in eternal peace. This argument is well known in the dissenting districts, and it has its effects, especially when it is combined with the want of Church room, and when the service of the conventicle is assimilated with certain modifications to the service of the Church. Our acquaintance with this popular argument had not, however, prepared us to learn, that the Church of England and the Church of Scotland form but one Church, distinguished only by their form of government, a trifle lighter than the air, when it suits the convenience of a writer so to represent it, but at all other times, a fountain and occasion of the bitterest acrimony and reproach.

"Amid the war of contending passions, systems, and opinions, it is consolatory to think that a Christian Church has been established and maintained in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. I speak only of one Christian Church, because I view the ecclesiastical constitutions of England and Scotland as forming *one* Church—associated under one head—in every view co-ordinate—maintained by the same state—equally pure in principle and efficient in operation." *Burns's View*, p. 3.

The only ground of this union and co-ordinacy of the Churches of England and Scotland, is that they are both established: the Church of England is established by law in England; the Church of Scotland is established by law in Scotland. The consistent Dissenters who object to the civil establishment of the Church of England, cannot approve the civil establishment of the Church of Scotland: but it is nevertheless established. The communion of the Church, which rests upon no better foundation than that of a civil establishment, is entirely of a local nature, and, in the present case, the river Tweed is its boundary and definition; so that the members of the Church of England and the members of the Church of Scotland are Churchmen or Dissenters according to the bank of the

river on which they may chance to stand: if that river should change its course the boundaries of communion and dissent would be contracted or enlarged; or if it should cease to flow, they might be thrown into inextricable confusion. Such is the unity of the Church, which depends on a legal establishment within a limited district.

Measured by this criterion, the Church of Scotland, as by law established, cannot be extended beyond the Tweed. Whatever may be its constitutional connection with the Church of Scotland, the Presbyterian kirk in London Wall is, in England, unquestionably a Dissenting congregation, and in no respect co-ordinate with the Church of England. Neither is the Church of Scotland established in any of the colonies, in which the civil establishment of religion must depend, not on the laws of England or of Scotland, but on the terms agreed upon on the first settlement or surrender of those colonies. The Church of Rome, as well as the Church of England, is established in Canada, and it is not pretended that the Church of Scotland is established in any of the colonies; and when, on the ground of civil establishment, she claims co-ordinacy with the Church of England, she must be content, upon the same ground, to partake of co-ordinacy with the Church of Rome. The Church of Scotland has no more claim to establishment in the colonies of Great Britain, than any sect which is not established in Great Britain, or than it has to claim establishment in the states of the Union in virtue of its establishment in Scotland. The colonists are deluded, if they are led to infer an establishment of Presbytery abroad from an establishment of Presbytery at home: and if such a claim should, at any time, be preferred, on the argument of numbers, it should be remembered, that upon this argument the Heathens have

the first, and the Catholics the second claim to establishment.

But it is pretended, that the co-ordinacy of the Church of Scotland is recognised, not only by the law, but by the canons and constitutions of the Church of England.

"This union in every thing but forms is recognized by the Church of England, for in Canon 55, which was framed in 1604, when the Church of Scotland had assumed a presbyterian form, her clergy were commanded to 'pray for the Churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland, as parts of Christ's holy Catholic Church, which is dispersed throughout the world.'" *Burns's View*, p. 3, 4.

It is a specious but not an insuperable argument: Mr. Milne replies:

"Canon 55 of the Church of England, which commands her clergy to pray for the Churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland, as part of Christ's holy Catholic Church, which is dispersed throughout the world, is no such recognition of the Kirk as Dr. Burns supposes. Presbyterian parity was introduced into Scotland and established in that kingdom as the scriptural and primitive form of Church government, in opposition to episcopacy, which was declared to be anti-christian and unlawful. But would the Church of England, in Canon 55, recognize persons holding such opinions, and acting upon them, as a part of Christ's holy Catholic Church, which is dispersed throughout the world, when, in Canon 7, she orders them to be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and so continue 'untill they 'repent and publicly revoke such' their 'wicked errors'? The reason of a child must perceive that the answer ought to be in the negative. The truth is, that when the Canon in question was framed, King James was seated on the throne of Elizabeth, and, as before his accession to that throne he had revived the name and office of bishop in Scotland, he was now pursuing the measures deemed prudent for the introduction and establishment of a true and regular episcopacy, 'not' says Bishop Guthrie, 'without the consent and furtherance of many of the wisest among the ministry.' In this Canon the Church of England is, therefore, not chargeable with the inconsistency and folly of contradicting her own doctrine, and undermining her own constitution, by recognizing the presbyterian parity of Scot-

land, or any thing peculiar to it and characteristic of it." P. 8.

This statement, to which Dr. Burns makes no reply beyond a vague charge of misrepresentation, is confirmed by *all* the prefatory canons, which distinctly recognize the authority of bishops and the supremacy of the king, and pronounce sentence of excommunication on all who dispute these doctrines. Even in the form of bidding prayer, as well as in the first canon, the title of the king, as "supreme governor in these his realms, and all other his dominions and countries, over all persons in all causes, as well ecclesiastical as temporal," is distinctly and unequivocally asserted and maintained. It certainly cannot be the intention of the Church, in this ecclesiastical recognition of the Church of Scotland, to give countenance to Presbyterianism, or to depreciate the divine and apostolical right of Episcopacy.

Another argument for the co-ordinacy of the Churches of England and Scotland, is collected from the incautious language of some divines in speaking of the origin of ecclesiastical polity. These are no more than private sentiments, having no authority to contradict the express declarations of the Church herself in her offices of ordination and consecration; they are a virtual attack upon the doctrine of the Church, and a gratuitous concession to the Dissenters, of which they will not fail to avail themselves; although they are happily too general and superficial to be compared with the precise and elaborate arguments of those theologians who have examined the question in all its parts. The easy confidence with which it is asserted and believed, that Christ left no form, or no permanent form and exemplary model of ecclesiastical government, has been again and again exposed and refuted by Bilson, Hooker, Leslie, Potter, Brett, Skinner, and Daubeney. When the reasonings of these

and other writers of the same class are refuted, and when the force of their inferences from the Scriptures, and of their researches into the history of the primitive Church are repelled, it will be time to rely on the assertions of other divines, and to have doubts of the apostolical origin and authority of prelacy.

But the foreign Churches are not governed by Bishops, and the doctrine of the foreign Churches has been approved by English Divines, and therefore the want of Episcopacy is immaterial. It is evident, from the tendency of their own writings, that the testimony of approbation which Bishop Hall, and Archbishop Wake, bore to the continental Church, respected their doctrine, and not their discipline and constitution. Some of the Protestant Churches, as in Denmark and Sweden, are still governed by Bishops: others, as in Prussia and Saxony, are placed under the control of Superintendants, which is in fact an illegitimate Episcopacy; and most of the foreign Protestants have admitted, that the want of Episcopacy is not a merit but a defect, originating in the hard necessity of the times of the Reformation. It was the anxious effort of Dr. Grabe, at the beginning of the last century, to remove these anomalies, and to supply these deficiencies by the revival of a pure Episcopacy in the Churches of the continent, and the sentiments of Calvin, are known to have been so friendly to the prelacy of this country, that he pronounced those who opposed it, to be worthy of every anathema, *nullo non anathemate dignos*. The want of Episcopal discipline, is an unseemly blemish in the Churches of the continent; but is this blemish of recent origin and limited extent, to be compared with the prevalence of Episcopacy, universally through the fifteen centuries before the Reformation, and widely since the Reformation through all the settlements of the Romish Church, through

the Protestant Churches in England and Ireland, Scotland and America, and now happily in Asia also; through the Greek Church in Russia and Turkey, in Egypt and Abyssinia, and through the extensive patriarchate of Antioch, stretching over to the secluded Christians of St. Thomas, in Malabar. These are the instances to which the appeal should be made abroad and at home, when it is intended to propagate the Gospel where it is not already known; or, if it is meant to revive its energies, where they are now nearly suppressed, it should be presented in a form in which it has been contemplated from ancient time, without the arbitrary appendages of Popery, or the equally arbitrary privations of Presbyterianism and Independency. If it was intended to replant the Church in Britain or Germany, the prejudices of the Sectaries might be consulted: in all other parts, it is necessary to respect the primitive constitution of the Church.

When the perpetual and universal claims of Episcopacy are thus superseded and abated, under pretence of a legal and canonical, a private and foreign recognition of Presbyterianism, it seems to be a work of supererogation, to inquire into the gradations of ministry recorded in the Scriptures; but it is an argument too plausible and deceptive to be omitted, to assert the identity of Bishops and Presbyters, in the Apostolic writings. The argument from the name, needs not to be debated: it is conceded, that the Apostles did designate the same order of ministry, under the different titles of Bishops and Presbyters: but it cannot from thence be inferred, that there is Scriptural authority for Presbyterian parity. They, who governed, and to whom the power of ordaining the ministry was committed in the first ages of the Church, were denominated Apostles: and it must be shewn, either that the Presbyters were of

equal authority with the Apostles, and administered the same offices, or the doctrine of Prelacy is unimpeached and unimpeachable. The Apostles were Presbyters, as the higher includes the lower order, and the Apostles Peter and John, did not disdain to call themselves Elders: but the Presbyters did not call themselves, nor were they called Apostles, nor had they the distinctive power of that higher order. The rule of Episcopacy is the subordination of the Presbyters to the Prelates: the rule of Presbyterianism is the parity of its ministers.

The Dissenters contend that Episcopacy is not founded on the Scriptures, and cannot be established upon legitimate inferences from the Scriptures. At the same time it is conceded, and the argument may be extended, as well to the various forms of Independency, as to the Presbyterianism established in the Church of Scotland, that

"The gradation of Church government as established in Scotland, has been admired by many who view it only as a human contrivance, warranted by expediency, not by Scripture.... Every iota of the Presbyterian scheme could not possibly be found in any scripture-example, although the *general system* is explicitly authorized by the practice of the primitive Church, as far as the cases occurred."—*Barns's View*, P. 25.

The question is thus resolved into the correctness of the inferences, from certain recorded facts: and the Episcopalian is confident of the result, whether the investigation be directed to the state of the Church under the immediate superintendence of Christ himself; or to that of the Church administered by his Apostles, under the extraordinary agency of the Holy Spirit; or to that of the primitive Christians, of which the proceedings are more fully detailed and recorded. In the time of Christ it will not be pretended, that the Seventy were of the same rank and

order as the Twelve, or that either were not subordinate to Christ: there was therefore in his time a gradation, and not a parity of ministry. In the time of his Apostles, the Deacons were confessedly an inferior order: of the Presbyters, if they did not sustain the office of the Seventy, as is commonly supposed, the origin is indistinct; but they were certainly not of the same rank with the Apostles, for the decree of the council of Jerusalem was formed, not in the name of the Apostles, or in the name of the Elders, but in the name of the Apostles and Elders: Saint Paul, also upon more than one occasion, speaks of Apostles and Prophets as distinct orders; and it may be shown, that the Prophets were equivalent to the Bishops and Presbyters. In the apostolic age, there was therefore a subordination in the ministry of the Church: the state of the primitive Church, is clearly exhibited by Mr. Milne, and no doubt is left of the sentiments of the Christian Fathers. There was indeed no dispute on the theory of ecclesiastical government, before the time of Arius; nor was there any deviation in practice before the time of the Reformation. Mr. Milne is also very successful in correcting various errors and misrepresentations, into which Dr. Burys had fallen, concerning the history of Prelacy, especially on the origin of Christianity, and ecclesiastical government in Scotland, on the views which the Scottish Reformers entertained concerning Prelacy; on the consecration of certain Bishops at the time of the Restoration; and on the state of the Episcopal Church in Scotland. These are points, which would naturally be agitated by Scottish polemics, in the midst of a Scottish population, and they could not be discussed without effect, by a Scotch Episcopalian, whose very character it is to be well versed in ecclesiastical antiquities. These points are, however, less interesting to the general

reader, and it is necessary to return from this cursory view of the principles of ecclesiastical government, to the ecclesiastical practice which obtains in the colonies, and to the censures which that practice calls forth in foreign settlements.

Doctor Burns pretends, that it is a misnomer to say, that the Church of *England* is established in *America*, and proceeds to offer a remark of more serious interest to his correspondent:

“If you had said that English Episcopacy is established in these colonies, and that the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge” (the Society for propagating the Gospel is meant) “supports a few Missionaries, under the name of Rectors, you would have been nearer the truth.”—*Letters*, P. 11.

It is very true that the English episcopacy is established in the provinces of Quebec and Nova Scotia, and in the latter province the establishment consists of the bishop and an ecclesiastical commissary. The zeal of the bishops in both provinces is unquestionable, and nothing is neglected which their limited means will allow them to attempt. A subscription has been recently raised in this country to assist in building churches, and the Society for propagating the Gospel has always lent its zealous and liberal aid in providing missionaries and schoolmasters. But is it worthy of a great nation to leave the religious interests of its colonists thus dependent on the casual charities of voluntary societies? Or if these colonies are too remote to receive from the government at home an efficient religious establishment, what shall be said of the state of the Scilly Islands, where a *missionary* is stationed, as in a heathen land, by the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge. The propagation and encouragement of schism appears to be a primary object in our colonial policy, and in the recent regulation for the new settlement at the Cape, it was proposed, that a certain number of settlers should have

liberty of providing a pastor of their own denomination. The Society for propagating the Gospel has happily turned its attention to this new settlement also; but the seeds of division have been sown, and the churchman has reason to apprehend that wherever his religion shall be established, it will be encountered and opposed.

Nothing could exceed the coldness and indifference of the authorities at home on the establishment of episcopacy in India, where the bishop was left to introduce himself without any other credentials or recommendation than his own commission. If the neglect was offensive, what was the wisdom or consistency of that policy, which judged it expedient to *establish* presbyterianism in India, in very opposition to episcopacy, and rendered it necessary that the bishop should enter upon his course by sustaining the authority of Episcopacy in opposition to the rude claims of Presbyterian parity? The answer shall be given in the words of a writer, in a New York publication, entitled "the Christian Journal and Literary Register," as they are quoted by Mr. Milne. Speaking of the happy results, which may in God's good time be expected from the establishment of the Church in the East by the appointment of Dr. Middleton to the See of Calcutta, he says,

"The second happy effect to be expected is the promotion of the cause of unity. One of the great objections of the natives to Christianity, is the division of its members into so various and contradictory forms of faith. Let the purity of the Gospel once shine forth in innocence of life and in unity of faith, and one of the great difficulties in the way of conversion will be removed. It is therefore with unfeigned regret, that we have read a most intemperate and insulting harangue of Dr. Brice, the representative of the Scotch Church against Episcopacy. This person was sent out at the same time with the bishop, for the sake of the many Scotch who were settled in India. All these, before the arrival of Dr. Brice, were in harmony with the Church of England, and willingly united in all its

forms of public worship. The first effect, therefore, of this measure was to create a schism where it found none, and in the person of Dr. Brice not only to create, but to foment division. It was not sufficient to tear open the wound and to separate the parts which had closed in Christian union, but to assail with little shew of reason, and less of temperance, the unoffending Church and its venerable head. Such are the triumphs of liberality!"

The case cannot be more worthily described, than in these words of the American journalist, and it is a case on which the English churchman will not soon cease to meditate, however he may be gratified by the interest and the compassion which the American feels in the wrongs of his Church. Dr. Burns offers some remarks on this statement, but they are conceived in such a spirit, and uttered in such a tone, that we will not injure him by reciting them. He acknowledges that "for want of a Scottish divine, those who belonged to the Scotch establishment had laudably conformed to the episcopal regime:" why, then, was this laudable conformity with a Church confessedly "pure in principle and efficient in operation," disturbed? No impatience of this discipline, no desire of reform, no wish for the restoration of the forms and principles of the Scotch Church had been expressed; but "the Scotch population of Calcutta is too numerous, too rich and too powerful to be dispensed with." When their grievances had been asserted, they might have been redressed; but they did not complain of injuries, because they did not feel them; they asked not for privileges, because they did not regret the want of them. Many of them had been separated from the kirk in early life, before the force of its principles was perceived; many had left it without any intention of returning to its bosom; many had never been educated within its pale. It was not in Calcutta, but it was in *Leadenhall-street*, that the want of Presbyterianism in India was felt, and it was well that the

design was not entertained of settling Presbyterianism in any other division in India. The scheme has not, however, answered the expectation of its projectors : and the Episcopal Church, however it may be counteracted and opposed for a season, will ultimately be consolidated and triumph in the East.

There is yet another evil resulting from the divided religion of the colonies. Its mischiefs do not terminate abroad in exciting the jealousies of the colonists, and in delaying the conversion of the natives. When the settlers return, they bring with them their religious antipathies, and if they are void of religion they rejoice in repeating the tale of its contentions ; or if they are sensible of its influence they are too prone to admit the rancour and jealousy of Sectarism. It is unjustly imagined, that orthodoxy is intolerant ; it is impatient of false doctrine, heresy, and schism, from a conviction of their dangerous tendency, but it is compassionate to the infirmities of human nature, and earnest in its supplications for all " who have erred and are deceived," and for all who profess and call themselves Christians, that they " may be led into the way of truth, and hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life." The episcopalian, in putting forth the claims of episcopacy, seeks no private interest, gratifies no personal passion, pursues no unlawful ambition ; but acts in a full conviction, that episcopacy is necessary and efficacious in all places of Christ's dominion, that it is of divine institution, and was designed for the consolidation of the Church to the end of time.

We have been content to undertake the cause of episcopacy, and to advocate, in a very cursory manner, the claims of Christian unity, and conformity with an apostolical Church, without taking notice of many insinuations which Dr. Burns has thrown in our way, and afforded ample occasion to retort. Dr.

Burns, and many other divines of the Church of Scotland, are ready to acknowledge the merits and excellence of the English Church and clergy, at the very time that they are overlooking or disputing the authority of its episcopal discipline. Our endeavour is more consistent : wherever our Church is established, we wish to see it settled in all its forms and principles, in all its beauty, and vigour, and strength ; we wish to see all its ordinances administered, all its discipline and subordination maintained. We desire, we pray for the enlargement of the Church, but as the best and most efficient means of that enlargement, we labour and pray for its reunion and consolidation, and we are persuaded that the more the episcopal influence is respected at home and extended abroad, the more readily will both these ends be accomplished. At the beginning of the last century Dr. Grabe and Archbishop Wake were severally engaged in projecting measures for the reunion of the Protestant Church. Their measures were abortive, but their object and their motive still claim the respect of the wise and good. The popular policy of the present day is to give licence and encouragement to every variety of religious opinion, and to propagate it to its fullest extent : the end of these experiments will appear in its season : one truth in the mean time is certain—there is no authority for the publication of error, or the establishment of schism.

Lay Preaching defended.—A few Plain Remarks for the Consideration of the People called Methodists, occasioned by the Conduct of Mr. Chas. Atmore, Superintendent of the London East Circuit, towards the Community Preachers. 8vo. pp. 16. Warder, 1820.

THE contents of this little pamphlet are so curious and instructive, that

we shall extract the principal passages for the information of our readers. "Note and comment" will suggest themselves in abundance, but we refrain from any attempt to heighten what is already perfect.

"Much alarm has been excited in the minds of many truly pious members of the Methodist society, in consequence of the late aristocratical exercise of power by the Superintendent of the London East Circuit, in the extinction of that useful class of men among them called Community Preachers; and, though it is maintained that the alarm is unfounded, because they are merely united with their Local brethren, and can continue their usefulness in the exercise of their gifts as before, yet the truly pious and sensible of this community begin to perceive, that, if it is in the power of an individual to annihilate a body of men, that existed during the life of the founder of Methodism, were constituted by him, have subsisted upwards of forty years, and are allowed to have rendered the most extensive usefulness to the society at large, having been the instruments of adding more members to the society than all the travelling preachers—a fact not so fully known as it ought to be; they have reason to fear, that another superintendent, possessing the like power, may take it into his head to annihilate the local preachers altogether: and from the contempt with which they are treated, such a circumstance would not be more inconsistent, or even a greater violation of power, than that lately exercised towards the community; for the same evils which rendered the community preachers so obnoxious to those who love power, exist among the local preachers, and no wonder that they are a source of jealousy. Though their value is not duly appreciated by the Methodists at large, yet God, who searches the hearts and tries the reins, graciously acknowledges them, by blessing them, and making them a blessing in their labour of love.

"That by worldly characters they should be despised, thought little of, and treated with contempt, is not to be wondered at, when their Lord and Master met with the same kind of treatment 1800 years before; but that their fellow-labourers in the same vineyard, and the people to whom they labour, that these should unite to pour contempt upon them, has often been a source of surprise and astonishment; but perhaps a variety of causes may exist to produce such effects. The principal will be found to proceed from

that unscriptural distinction which subsists between the travelling and local preachers. Under this impression allow me to offer a few thoughts on the utility of the local and community preachers, which appear to be calculated to set their disinterested conduct and extensive usefulness in their proper scriptural point of view.

"The principles which actuate them are unquestionably: 1st, an endeavour to obey the command of their Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, *Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature.*—And 2dly, a desire to follow the Apostles and first preachers of the Gospel, as they followed Jesus Christ, striving to imitate them in simplicity and obedience to the commands of God, scorning to traffic with gifts and graces they have undeservedly received; but having freely received, they freely communicate, looking to God for his blessing. And though they are frequently discouraged on account of the importance of the work and their want of ability; and though frequently discouraged by the treatment they receive, both from the travelling preachers and the people at large, who manifest so much ingratitude, after their walking frequently ten and fifteen miles to do them good; yet remembering, that from the first God chose the foolish things of this world to confound the wisdom of the wise, and the weak things to confound the mighty, that no flesh might glory in his presence—remembering that his kingdom is not of this world, nor ever can be united with it; that by his own example of humility and frequent directions to his disciples to imitate him, and not to be conformed to this world, no, not even to assume titles of distinction, indicating the office to which he had appointed them. His language is, *Be ye not called Rabbi* (no nor REVEREND, nor any other title of distinction, for that is the unquestionable meaning) *for one is your master, even Christ, and ye are brethren.* The Apostles and first preachers of the Gospel, though wonderfully gifted, and their ministry so greatly blessed, did obey their Lord and Saviour in this respect, following their usual employment. They feel compelled to continue, though the opposition should be equal to that which their predecessors met with on the first propagation of the Gospel in the world."

P. 2.

"How lamentable it is to see the same evils creeping in among them, that destroyed Christianity in former times, and which have invariably destroyed every revival of it since the times of the Apostles,

viz. conformity to the world on the part of the preachers, which has produced a like conformity on the part of the people. The paid preachers (for it is strange to tell there are two sorts of Methodist preachers) of the present day, though possessing the same gifts, pointedly different and distinct; the one paid and the other not; the former, instead of continuing, as they did in Mr. Wesley's days, the servants of Christ, for the sake of his children, are become fine gentlemen, assuming worldly titles, and the exclusive right to administer the Lord's Supper and baptizing infants; calling themselves clergymen, and confining the title exclusively to themselves; collecting immense sums of money for various purposes, and expending it as they think proper, without the people having any possible means of ascertaining whether properly or not; becoming extensive freeholders and landholders; possessing houses, furniture, and chapels to an enormous amount, all carefully made over to themselves; so that the trustees are mere non-entities, having not the least right or title to any of the property. The others are generally poor, unassuming, willing to be any thing or nothing, that the Gospel be not blamed; rejecting this world's honours, they follow their heavenly Master and his Apostles, through evil as well as good report, considering it all their business here below to behold the way to God, and sing with the poet,

‘Happy, if with my latest breath,
I may but gasp his name,
Preach him to all, and cry in death,
Behold! behold the Lamb!’

“These truly disinterested and pious apostolic individuals, with their brethren, the exhorters, class leaders, prayer leaders, and all the other gifted individuals in the church are termed laymen, and considered as separate and distinct from the circuit or paid preachers, who term themselves clergymen. We may safely affirm that no such distinction subsisted between Jesus Christ and his disciples, or between Paul and his companions; in fact it is not to be found in the Sacred Scriptures, or in the history of the church in its purity. We may as safely affirm that this distinction has been the primary cause of all the evils that have befallen the church of God; for it is one of the first steps of the mystery of iniquity, by which the man of sin acquired so much power. It was foreseen by the Apostle Paul: ‘*For know, that after my departure shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock; also of your own selves, shall men arise,*

speaking perverse things, to draw away the disciples after them, which perverse things are, in a great measure, teaching the people, that they (the circuit preachers) must be kept separate and distinct, and considered as the inheritance of God: that’s the meaning of clergy. See Dr. Campbell.” P. 6.

“Reflecting upon the fact deduced, that the circuit preachers are paid for their preaching, and that they have all the power, authority, and property in their hands; whilst the local preachers have no power, no authority, or even property, and yet continue to exercise their gift by preaching the Gospel, and if compared with the circuit preachers, they may say with their predecessors in the great work, ‘*In labours more abundant.*’—The conclusion is inevitable; the former are mere hirelings, whereas the latter must be the genuine successors of the Apostles, and the faithful servants of the Lord Jesus Christ.” P. 8.

“The distinction between clergy and laity has nothing to support it in the Gospel of Jesus Christ, or in the example of his Apostles and Evangelists; but is in direct opposition both to the spirit of the Gospel and the example of its first preachers, which example the Holy Ghost has been pleased to reveal for our instruction and imitation. When our blessed Saviour sent forth the twelve disciples, he said, ‘*Go preach, saying, the kingdom of heaven is at hand. Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses, nor scrip for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes nor yet staves; for the workman is worthy of his meat; freely ye have received, freely give.*’ Yet at the missionary meetings we are exhorted to contribute largely for fitting out missionaries, and supporting them when they are fitted out; as if no such direction as that just quoted was to be found in the sacred Scriptures; and what renders it more antisciptural is, the individuals that are sent out are generally those local preachers, shoe-makers and other mechanics, who were permitted to preach in England, and follow their usual employments; but when sent out as missionaries, though in nine cases out of ten they might support themselves by their labour, as in England. Oh! no; they must be kept in idleness and laziness, supported by the pence squeezed out of the pockets of the poor. Is it to be wondered at, that so little good springs from such a corrupt fountain. Towards the support of about 250 missionaries, the enormous sum of 100,000*l.*, or thereabouts, is raised annually in England, independent of the enormous sums collect-

ed by themselves at the respective places, which probably amount to twice that sum; these sums united would be sufficient to send the Gospel of Jesus Christ to all parts of the habitable globe." P. 10.

"It would not be difficult to prove, that all the heresies, corruptions, and abuses, that have crept into the Church since the days of Jesus Christ, have arisen in consequence of supporting the preachers in idleness and laziness, under an idea of increasing their usefulness; which idea is perhaps the most subtle mode in which self-righteousness works. The preachers among the quakers are as useful, popular, and all persons bear testimony of them generally as being eloquent and mighty in the Scripture; yet they are not supported by the body, and there can be no question but that this is the reason, under God, and the principal reason why the quakers continue their piety and simplicity for so long a time. In fact they are the only body of Christians that have continued for two centuries, retaining their primitive simplicity; and the reason is, no doubt, because they, and they only, follow Jesus Christ and his Apostles, according to the account we have of them in the sacred Scriptures. Among the Methodists, a man that has laboured perhaps for years as a local preacher, supporting himself by industry, and contributing to the necessity of the poor saints, after a time gets appointed to a circuit, that is, gets a comfortable living without working; not that he has to preach more than before, but by giving up his secular employment, he becomes qualified to administer the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper; he becomes a clergyman, and is entitled to the title *Reverend*, why, wherefore, and for what reason no layman can possibly conceive; but, no doubt, it is perfectly right and satisfactory to that secret inquisitorial assembly, which meets once a year, under the name of 'The Conference.'

"The local preachers, thus transformed into reverend divines, leave the path pointed out for them by God, and follow one more suited to their own carnal ease and comfort. Before they despised the aid of worldly appearance, went about preaching the word of God among the people, from house to house, strengthening the saints, gathering in souls to Christ; following the Apostles and first preachers of the Gospel as they followed Christ, in all plainness and in simplicity, in all self-denial and humility; rejoicing to be accounted weak, contemptible, and foolish, for Christ's sake, that his wisdom and

power might be more conspicuous in their abasement; yea were content to preach in common tradesmen's dress, as Jesus Christ himself had done, who appeared so much like the rest of his brethren, that even Judas himself was obliged to go with the chief priests, when he betrayed him, not being able to describe a difference, so as to point him out personally: but now they no longer go about discipling men to Christ, as he commanded, but they must come after them to be discipled, and pay for it too before hand, or they must stay and perish. They are not content as formerly, to preach in the dress of plain, unlearned, unclassical tradesmen, and as the Lord, his apostles, and disciples did; but must have a garb peculiar to classical scholars, men of eminence and learning, such as lawyers, counsellors, and judges are." P. 12.

"The local and community preachers in Mr. Wesley's days, were not so much despised as they are at present, yet they are not less respectable now, either in their talents or property than formerly: they are not less zealous or pious; they contribute largely to the support of Methodism with their property, time, and talents—so largely, that not one quarter of the chapels, either in London or the country, could be supplied with preaching on the Sabbath day without them. Though the majority of them are poor, as it respects worldly property, yet all allow that they are rich in faith, and, as far as can be judged, heirs of promise." P. 15.

"As these apostolic individuals were more highly valued for their works sake, when Methodism was more in its infancy, than they are at present; and as they are equally as pious and zealous now as before, there must be some cause or reason for this change. Is not the cause, that superiority which the paid preachers have assumed and maintained over them; and the reason, that distinction which they make by taking to themselves the title of *Reverend*, and making the people believe they are clergymen, whereas the local and community preachers are mere laymen." P. 16.

"Under an impression, that such is the case, feeling convinced that such conduct has nothing in the inspired volume to support it, and fearing, that if persevered in, Methodistical priesthood and tyranny will be as manifest and oppressive as the Romish hierarchy was, and fraught with the same evils, because originating from the same source; I have endeavoured to point out that this distinction has nothing in Scripture to support it; but is evidently one of the first steps of the mystery of ini-

quity, by which the man of sin acquired so much power. I have endeavoured likewise to set before you the importance of the local and community preachers, hoping that their disinterested conduct and extensive usefulness will be more highly valued, and themselves more encouraged to proceed in the labour of love and work of charity.

"To prevent the evils which have already manifested themselves, increasing, and to restore Methodism to its primitive simplicity and usefulness, is the sole object of the writer of these remarks; and it appears, you have it in your power, and upon the proper application of it standeth or falleth Methodism. No one doubts your love to your preachers. Let me ask you, do you love them? then in the name of common sense, do not hurry them headlong to destruction, by laying snares hither and thither, by heaping money upon them with so lavish a hand. Let us take our stand as firm men, and revert to Methodistical principles sixty years back. *Let every one*

who has been in the habit of contributing his guinea quarterly, and shilling weekly, or 2s. 6d. quarterly, and two pence weekly, reduce these sums to one half, and the evils are got rid of at once." P. 16.

We cannot conclude without bestowing a merited panegyric upon the eloquent lay preacher (for such he evidently is) who has put us in possession of all this valuable information. The zeal with which he defends his own order, the perspicuity with which he exposes the inconsistencies of the *reverend Wesleyans*, his free born abhorrence of usurpation and tyranny, and his incomparable plan for the humiliation of his enemies, by cutting off their supplies, prove him to be the genuine and primitive Methodist, prove him to be as adroit as Wesley and as disinterested as Whitfield.

MONTHLY REGISTER.

Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.

[Extracts from the Annual Report concluded.]

Prince Edward's Island.

"It was announced in the Report of last year, that the Society had extended their superintending care to Prince Edward's Island, and, independently of placing the Rev. Theophilus Desbrisaye, who had for many years been the sole Minister of the Church of England in that Province, on their list of Missionaries, had adopted the Rev. Cornelius Griffin, and placed him at the disposal of the Governor. This gentleman announced his arrival in the early part of the Summer, when he was most graciously received by his Excellency and his Majesty's Council. Under their patronage he has every prospect of being able to introduce the National System of Education, having carried out with him a young man, well instructed in England for that very purpose. Hitherto his duties have been confined to Charlotte Town, where he established, with some success, an Evening Lecture; but his Excellency has lately appointed

him Rector of George Town, where a flourishing Settlement of English emigrants has been established; and he hopes a more extensive scene of usefulness will be open to him.

Canada.

"The Lord Bishop of Quebec, in the early part of the year, was induced to draw the attention of the Society to the peculiar circumstances of Quebec, where the labours of the Minister have of late years increased to such an extent as to exceed the powers of any one individual adequately to discharge. During the last three months the funerals exceeded one hundred; a circumstance from which an estimate might be formed of the extent of those duties which are entailed upon a Clergyman who is desirous to fulfil them in a manner satisfactory to his conscience, and more especially of that important and laborious office attendance upon the sick. Upon this representation, and feeling likewise that hitherto the whole ecclesiastical duty of the three principal cities of Canada has been maintained independently of the resources of the Society, they have agreed to appoint an assistant Missionary at Quebec, with a salary of 200*l.*, with an

understanding, that he may be at liberty to employ his Sundays in the performance of Divine Worship, in some of the adjoining Districts. During the Summer, the Rev. Mr. Jenkins left England to undertake this office, but contrary winds, and the severity of the weather, compelled him to seek shelter in Prince Edward's Island, where he was obliged to remain during the winter.

"The Bishop reports, that Sir Peregrine Maitland had communicated to him, that by a late treaty, 20,000 acres of land in the Missisaga territory, and 40,000 in that of the Mohawks, had been ceded to Government; and that his Excellency had expressed his readiness to appropriate the lands themselves, or the monies arising from the sale of them to the Society, in trust, to provide the said Indians with Missionaries, Catechists, and Schoolmasters. The Society have signified their acquiescence in this arrangement; and have requested the Bishop to procure a draft of a power of attorney, and transmit it to the Society, by which his Lordship might be empowered to act in their name, for the purposes aforesaid.

"During the last year, to meet the growing wants of a rapidly increasing population, and to facilitate the measures which are now in progress for the division of the Seigniories and Townships in the two Provinces into Parishes, wherever Clergymen of the Church of England are established, the sum of 2000*l.* was placed at the disposal of the Bishop of Quebec, in aid of the expences attending the erection of Churches throughout the Diocese. Previously to this grant, the Society had in various instances encouraged the laudable efforts of the people, by assistances of the same nature, but it was considered that the occasion required a more ostensible proof of their readiness to afford every encouragement for the Propagation of the Gospel. Independently of this considerable aid, and to promote the same object, another source of encouragement has been opened by the bequest of the Rev. Thomas How, Rector of Huntshill, Somersetshire, who has left by his will, to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, the sum of 1000*l.*, in trust for the erection of Churches in Canada.

"The Bishop has already appropriated some portion of the Society's grant to two different Churches, but his Lordship will in no case authorize the actual payment of the money until the Churches are raised and covered in. The Bishop adds, the pious liberality of the Society appears to have produced the happiest effects; it was na-

tural indeed that it should tend to attach the inhabitants to the Church, and to call forth their exertions to qualify themselves for obtaining the establishment of Missions among them, and this it has evidently done.

"The Rev. William McCawley, Missionary at Hamilton, reports, that the progress of the Church of England has been as favourable as he could expect, and though the attendance on Public Worship is not so numerous as he could wish, yet a visible improvement has taken place in the moral and religious dispositions of the people. When he first arrived in the Mission, there was no place of Public Worship, but now there are several of various descriptions, which he cannot fail to attribute to the example exhibited by the Members of the Church, and hopes may be entertained that the religious feeling, thus excited, may hereafter be united in one form of Worship. He occasionally officiates in the neighbouring Township, which is equally populous with that of Hamilton. By the exertion of the people, and the aid of 100*l.* from a fund collected by the Hon. and Rev. Dr. Stewart, a church, of the dimensions of fifty-five feet by forty feet, has been erected, and will be ready for Divine Service in a few weeks. The Township is situated on a neck of land between Lake Ontario and the Rice Lake, and is capable of producing every article for the comfort and support of the inhabitants, who appear to be uniformly well disposed, and desirous of assisting one another. Mr. McCawley is duly impressed with a sense of his good fortune, in being placed in such a situation, and is thankful to Almighty God for the advantages he enjoys.

"The Rev. Robert Addison, Missionary at Niagara, reports, that the Lieutenant-Governor had appropriated 500*l.* to the repair of the Church, which had suffered so materially during the war, by the injuries of the enemy; he himself had undertaken to superintend the repairs, which he was in hopes would soon be completed. Mr. Norton had not yet finished the translation of the Gospel of St. Matthew, but he proposed to devote all his leisure time to the work; and when the season would permit of travelling, Mr. Addison intended to visit the Indian Country, and personally to urge forward its completion. Repeated assurance had been given to Mr. Norton, that the Society would readily defray all the necessary expences of printing, and afford every means for facilitating the progress of the undertaking.

"The Rev. Dr. Strachan, Missionary

at York, reports, that the church, which was much too small for the congregation, has been repaired and enlarged at the expence of 1,700l, the money was readily subscribed by the parishioners, to be returned from the sale of pews, which took place at the commencement of the year, subject to a ground rent of one or two pounds sterling. The money raised exceeded the amount of the expences incurred by the repair. The building is sixty-six feet by sixty. The Hon. G. Crookshanks has presented a handsome set of church ornaments; the communicants have increased from 55 to 64. There is a flourishing Sunday School, consisting of

30 Girls and 50 Boys; the Girls are taught by the three daughters of the Chief Justice; there is likewise a large Sunday School attached to the chapel in the country, where Dr. Strachan preaches once in the month.—Every quarter, the Schools are collected together in the presence of his Excellency Sir Peregrine Maitland, who takes the greatest interest in every thing that concerns the promotion of religion. After the examination, rewards are distributed to those whose good conduct and proficiency have deserved the attention of the Lieutenant-Governor."

MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

ECCLESIASTICAL PREFERMENTS.

The lord bishop of Exeter has been pleased to nominate the rev. J. D. Cole-ridge, LL.B. curate of St. Sidwell's, Exeter, one of his lordship's chaplains.

The rev. R. Fiske, B.D. rector of Wendon Lofts with Elmton annexed, Essex, to hold by dispensation the vicarage of Great Chishill, in that county; patron, John Wilkes, esq. of Lofts Hall.

The rev. J. Chamberlyne, to the vicarage of Wellington, Derbyshire; patron, the corporation of Etwall and Benton.

The rev. Edward Combe, to the rectories of Earnshill and Donyatt, Somerset, vacant by the death of the rev. Thomas Hopkins; patron, Richard Thomas Combe, esq.

The rev. Robert Crockett, M.A. of Brasenose college, Oxford, to the rectory of Nailston cum Normanton, Leicestershire; patron, the King.

The rev. Thomas D'Eve Betts, B.A. to the rectory of Colney, Norfolk; patron, Jehosaphat Postle, esq. of Colney Hall.

The rev. John Nelson, B.A. to the rectory of Winterton, with the chapel of Somerton, in Norfolk; patron, E. Cooper, esq. of East Dereham.

The rev. W. Evans, appointed chaplain of the Queen Charlotte.

The rev. D. H. Sanders, to the living of Ambledon, in Pembrokeshire; patron, the archbishop of Canterbury.

The rev. John Singleton, to the rectory of Sutterby, near Spilsby, in Lincolnshire; patron, the lord chancellor.

The rev. John Jacob, to the head mastership of the dock classical and mathematical school, at Plymouth.

The rev. T. Mills, B.A. to the rectory and parish church of Stutton, Suffolk, on his own petition.

The rev. John Latey, to the rectory of Rede, Suffolk; patron, the King.

The rev. H. De Foe Baker, M.A. to the vicarage of Greatham, Rutlandshire; patron, earl Winchelsea.

The rev. James C. H. Stokes, M.A. rector of Birchanger, appointed chaplain to the countess of Dysart.

The rev. Francis George Leach, M.A. fellow of Pembroke college, Oxford, appointed domestic chaplain to the right hon. John Frederic lord Cawdor, of Castlemerton, in the county of Pembroke.

The earl of Malmesbury has appointed the rev. H. Boucher, B.A. of Wadham college, and the rev. T. Cooke, of Oriel college, Oxford, his domestic chaplains.

The rev. George Randolph, M.A. student of Christ church, Oxford, to the vicarage of Eastray with Worth, near

Sandwich, Kent; patron, the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The rev. J. Royle, to the vicarage of Islington, Norfolk; patron, the King.

The rev. Mr. Winter, late curate of Milton, appointed chaplain to the Kent county prison, in the room of the rev. G. Harker, resigned.

The rev. L. J. Boor, to be master of the free grammar school, at Bodmin.

The rev. C. G. Boyles, to the vicarage of Tamerton Foliot, Devon.

The rev. Charles Ingle, M.A. fellow of Peter House, to the vicarage of Orston, Notts.; patron, the duke of Rutland.

UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.

OXFORD, August 25.—On Sunday se'n night the following gentlemen were ordained by the lord bishop of Salisbury.

DEACONS.—George Perceval Sandilands, Trinity college; John Pierce Marice, M.A. Brasenose college; George Ernest Howman, M.A. Balliol college; Charles Silvanus Meech, St. Edmund hall; John Marshall, B.A. Exeter college; George Parry Hollis, St. Alban hall; Henry Dixon, B.A. Brasenose college; Charles Francis Johnson, B.A. Queen's college.

PRIESTS.—The hon. Adolphus Frederick Irby, B.A. St. Mary hall; Alexander Hobert Charles Dallas, Worcester college; Henry Boucher, B.A. Wadham college; Charles Fowell Watts, Queen's college; Richard Derby Ness, B.A. Lincoln college.

Oxford Election.—The following is a summary of the Members of the several Colleges, as they respectively polled for Mr. Heber and for Sir J. Nicholl:—

Nicholl. Heber.

University College.....	19	18	37
Balliol College.....	17	21	38
Merton College.....	11	23	34
Exeter College.....	29	6	35
Oriel College.....	18	54	72
Queen's College.....	57	42	79
New College.....	12	28	40
Lincoln College.....	11	15	26
All Soul's College.....	16	21	37
Magdalen College.....	16	39	55
Brazen Nose College ..	2	159	161
Corpus Christi College....	28	4	32
Christ Church.....	96	66	162
Trinity College.....	10	27	37
St. John's College.....	77	2	79

Carried forward 399 525 924

Brought forward	399	525	924
Jesus College	25	14	39
Wadham College.....	12	13	25
Pembroke College.....	10	16	26
Worcester College.....	56	6	62
St. Mary Hall.....	3	9	12
Magdalen Hall.....	4	13	17
New Inn Hall.....	0	1	1
Alban Hall.....	5	4	9
Edmund Hall.....	4	11	15
Professor	1	0	1

519 612 1131

CORNWALL.—Died, at St. Just, the rev. J. Allen.

DEVONSHIRE.—On Tuesday, September 11, the new church of West Teignmouth, was consecrated by the lord bishop of Exeter; and on the following day his lordship held a confirmation.

Died suddenly, the rev. Jonathan Williams, on his return from Maker, where he had been to dinner with the bishop of Exeter. He was in his 70th year.

Died, in his 76th year, the rev. Gilman Wall, rector of Pit Portcon.

Died, the rev. Mr. Rush, rector of Powerstock, in this county.

Died, the rev. S. Pidsley, rector of Up-
lowman, and Sampford Peverell, in this county.

DORSETSHIRE.—Died, in London, the rev. C. Place, eldest and last surviving son of the rev. Henry Place, rector of Marnhall, in this county.

ESSEX.—Died, at Downham Hall, in the 86th year of his age, the rev. Peter Beauvoir.

Died, the rev. Dr. William Lee, aged 68, thirty-one years rector of New Sampford, Essex, in the gift of New college, Oxford.

HEREFORDSHIRE.—Died, the rev. Geo. Cope, D.D. canon residentiary of the cathedral at Hereford, in the 66th year of his age.

Died, at Cradley, the rev. T. Best.

KENT.—Died, at the house of his son, the rev. Thomas Knox, at Tunbridge, the rev. Vicesimus Knox, D.D. rector of Runwell, and Ramsden Crays, in Essex, aged 68.

LINCOLNSHIRE.—Died, in his 86th year, the rev. Jeremiah Ellis, D.D. rector of Leadenham, and vicar of Sibsey, in this county, and formerly of King's college, Cambridge.

NORFOLK.—Died, in his 78th year, the rev. B. W. Salmon, nearly forty years rector of Caister, in this county.

OXFORDSHIRE.—On Monday, August 27, the foundation-stone of the Oxford lunatic asylum, was laid by the lord bishop of the diocese, with the usual ceremonies, in the presence of the acting pro vice-chancellor, the president of Trinity, and other gentlemen of the university and city.

SHROPSHIRE.—Died, in his 38th year, the rev. George Hancox, rector of Knuckin, Salop, and vicar of Wasperton, Warwickshire.

Died, at Lentwardine, the rev. John Morris, curate of that place upwards of forty years.

Died, the rev. K. Atcherley, curate of Hughley.

Died, the rev. Richard Hill, rector of Waters, Upton.

SOMERSETSHIRE.—Died, aged 72, the rev. G. H. Leigh, vicar of Dunster and Minehead.

Died, the rev. John Mill, vicar of Compton Dundon, Somerset, and curate of Sheston St. Peter and Holy Trinity.

Died, at Bath, the rev. G. Jaques, vicar of Batisford, Suffolk.

SUFFOLK.—Died, the rev. C. Cole, rector of Stutton, in this county.

WILTSHIRE.—The rev. J. Ford, of Romsey, is appointed a surrogate by the hon. and rev. the chancellor of the diocese.

WORCESTERSHIRE.—The handsome new tower of St. Helen's church, in the city of Worcester, is completed, and the musical peal of eight bells belonging to this venerable structure have been re-hung.

YORKSHIRE.—On the 13th of September the first stone of a new church was laid at Stanley, in the parish of Wakefield, by Francis Maude, esq. of Hatfield Hall.

IN AND NEAR LONDON.

Died, at his house in Upper Thornhaugh-street, the rev. Thomas Exon, aged 70.

He was rector of Exton 47 years, a friendly and good man, very much esteemed, and now regretted by all who knew him.

At Kensington, the rev. Joseph Butler, son of Joseph Butler, esq. of Kirby House, Berks, and fellow of Pembroke college, Oxford.

Died, at Twickenham, in the 4th year of his age, the rev. Henry Pratt Beauchamp, M.A. fellow of King's college, Cambridge.

Died, at Peckham, in his 67th year, the rev. George Gibson, M.A. of Carlisle house school, Lambeth, of Magdalen hall, Oxford, and late minister of Carlisle chapel.

WALES.

THE EISTEDDFODD.—This glorious national festival commenced on Wednesday, September 12, at Carnarvon, with a splendour unparalleled in the annals of the principality. The county hall was crowded to excess; and on the second day of the meeting, so great was the pressure to obtain admittance, that an adjournment to the court of the castle, moved by the noble president, was carried by acclamation. Among the numerous company were the following noblemen and gentlemen, together with a considerable portion of the female branches of their families: the most noble the marquis of Anglesea, who presided; the earl of Uxbridge; the right rev. the lord bishop of Bangor; the right hon. the lord Newborough, &c. At the public dinner, on Thursday, colonel Parry, whose eloquence is only exceeded by the energy with which he delivers his sentiments, alluded to the circumstance of the return of lord Newborough, after many years absence from Wales, on proposing his lordship's health, in very forcible and animated language. The concerts and ball were admirably attended, and every thing combined to render the meeting agreeable in the extreme. The revival of the ancient music and poetry of this part of Great Britain, is in itself so interesting an object, that the sensation it has created is no longer astonishing.

MONTHLY LIST OF PUBLICATIONS.

A Sermon, preached at the Coronation of King George IV. in the Abbey Church of Westminster, July 19, 1821. By Edward, Lord Archbishop of York. Published by his Majesty's Special Command. 2s.

The Rights of Sovereignty in Christian States, defended in some chief particulars: a Charge, delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of London, May 24, 1821. With Dissertations and Collections illustrating the same Subject; with Reference to the Works of Mr. Hooker and Bishop Warburton; together with those of Grotius, De Marca, and others. By Joseph Holden Pott, A.M. Vicar of St. Martin in the Fields, and Archdeacon of London. 8vo. 9s.

Deism compared with Christianity; being an Epistolary Correspondence, containing all the principal Objections against Revealed Religion, with the Answers annexed: in which is shown the Insufficiency of the Arguments used in support of Infidelity. By Edward Chichester, M.A. Rector of the Parishes of Caldaff and Cloncha, in the Diocese of Derry. 3 vols. 1l. 7s.

Sacramental Addresses and Meditations, with a few Sermons interspersed. By the Rev. Henry Belfrage, Falkirk. Vol. II. 12mo. 5s. 6d.

Thoughts on the Music and Words of Psalmody, as at present used among the Members of the Church of England. By the Rev. Rann Kennedy, A.M. Minister of St. Paul's Chapel, and Second Master of King Edward's Grammar School, Birmingham. 4s.

Practical Lectures upon the Six first Chapters of the Gospel of St. John. By the Rev. John Rogers Pitman, M.A. Alternate Morning Preacher at Belgrave and Berkeley Chapels; and Alternate Evening Preacher at the Foundling and Magdalen Hospitals. 8vo. 13s.

Communications to the Christian World, being a Consideration of the Numbers of Daniel relative to the Reign of the Infidel Power, and of the last Persecution of the Church of Christ under the Harvest and

Vintage of God's Wrath. By the Rev. Edward Hoblyn, A.B. a Graduate of University College, Oxford, and Curate of the Parish of Liskeard, in the County of Cornwall. 12mo. 4s. 6d.

Clavis Apostolica; or, a Key to the Apostolic Writings, being an Attempt to explain the Scheme of the Gospel, and the principal Words and Phrases used by the Apostles in describing it. By the Rev. Joseph Mendham, A.M. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

A Letter to the Rev. Joseph Wilson, A.M. in Reply to his Remarks upon the Bishop of Peterborough's Eighty-seven Questions: with a Postscript, occasioned by his further Remarks. By one of the Curates of the Diocese of Peterborough. 2s.

A Summary of Orthodox Belief and Practice, according to the Opinions and Sentiments of the First Reformers; intended for Young Persons in the more educated Classes of Society: principally compiled from the celebrated Work of Dean Nowell. By the Rev. John Pro-wett, A.M., late Fellow of New College, Oxford; Rector of Edburton, Sussex. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

The peculiar Difficulties of the Clergy in India, a Sermon preached at the Second Visitation of the Lord Bishop of Calcutta, at St. Thomas's Church, Bombay, on Monday, March 5, 1821. By the Rev. Thomas Robinson, A.M. Chaplain of Poona. 1s. 6d.

A Sermon, preached before the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, at their Anniversary Meeting in the Parish Church of St. Mary-le-Bow, on Friday, Feb. 16, 1821. By the Right Rev. Herbert, Lord Bishop of Peterborough. Together with the Report of the Society for the Year 1820; to which are annexed, Lists of the Society's Missionaries, Catechists, and School Masters, and of the Incorporated and Associated Members of the Society. 2s. 6d.

A Charge, delivered by the Right Rev. John, Lord Bishop of Bristol, at his Primary Visitation of that Diocese, in August, 1821. 2s.

A Charge, delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Killaloe, at the Ordinary Visitation, Wednesday, July the 25th, 1821. By Richard Mant, D.D. Bishop of Killaloe and Kilfenora. 2s. 6d.

A Charge, delivered in July, 1821, at Stokesly, Thirsk, and Malton, to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Cleveland. By the Venerable and Rev. Francis Wraugham, M.A. F.R.S. 1s.

A Sermon, preached in the Church of St. Giles in the Fields, on Sunday, July 8, 1821, in Behalf of the Royal West London Infirmary and Lying-in Institution, Charing Cross. By the Rev. Charles Webb Le Bass, A.M. late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 1s. 6d.

Plain Discourses, doctrinal and prac-

tical; adapted to a Country Congregation. By the Rev. Charles Hardinge, A.M. Vicar of Tunbridge, Kent; and Rector of Crowhurst, Sussex. 12mo. 6s.

Familiar Dialogues on interesting Subjects, intended for the Amusement and Instruction of young Ladies, in their Hours of Leisure on Sundays. By a Lady. 18mo. 3s.

An Account of a New Process in Painting: in Two Parts. Part I. Containing, Remarks on its general Correspondence with the Peculiarities of the Venetian School. Part II. Supplementary Details, explanatory of the Process; with Miscellaneous Observations on the Arts of the Sixteenth Century. 8vo. 8s.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

Mr. William Hutton, an Officer in the African Company's Service, has in the Press, *Voyages and Travels in Africa*, in an octavo Volume, with Maps and Plates.

Mr. J. I. Wilson is preparing a History of Christ's Hospital, from its Foundation to the present Time, with Memoirs of eminent Men educated there.

Mr. J. H. Glover is preparing a Biographical Dictionary of Literature, from the Year 1700 to the End of 1820, containing the Title, &c. of every principal Work, which has appeared during that Period.

A Picture of Ancient Times, and a Sketch of Modern History, in a most exact Chronological Order, forming a Pair of Maps for the Study of Universal History, by Miss Thomson, will shortly appear.

Memoirs of the celebrated Persons composing the Kit Cat Club, with an Ac-

count of the Origin of the Association, will soon appear in a large quarto Volume, illustrated by forty-eight Portraits from the original Paintings, by Sir Godfrey Kneller.

Mr. W. M. Craig is printing a Course of Lectures on Drawing, Painting, and Engraving, delivered at the Royal Institution, in an octavo Volume, with Wood Cuts and Plates.

Mr. D. Boileau has in the Press, a Dictionary of French Homonymes, or a New Guide to the Peculiarities of the French Language, particularly designed for those who are desirous of acquiring the Language of social Intercourse.

Sir S. E. Brydges, Bart. will soon publish, in three Volumes, *The Hall of Hellingsley*, a Tale.

The Pirate, by the Author of *Waverley*, is in Preparation.

POLITICAL RETROSPECT.

THE disturbances which agitated the metropolis during the month of August, have gradually died away, and there is no reason to apprehend an immediate renewal of them. The evil intentions of the mob-leaders

were too thinly disguised, to escape the observation of any but the very lowest of the people; and the barefaced perjuries of the witnesses who were called for the purpose of criminating the military, have been

so completely exposed, that a jury, which had shewn strong symptoms of putting implicit confidence in their falsehoods, has not ventured to persevere in its credulity; and the party by whom such evidence was collected and brought forward, has been covered with well-deserved disgrace. Ministers have decidedly declared their opinion of the transaction by censuring the magistrate who was at the head of the police, and recommending his Majesty to dismiss Sir Robert Wilson from the army. It is to be feared that the latter was deeply implicated in the tumult; that he took a part highly inconsistent with his station and his duty, seems to be almost universally admitted. The former, Sir Robert Baker, is not suspected of any more serious offence, than a want of decision and firmness; and much as we may regret the retirement of a respectable public officer, we must confess that such deficiencies form a sufficient disqualification for the post of chief magistrate in such a metropolis as London.

The King's visit to Ireland concluded amid the same lively demonstrations of affection and gratitude that were called forth by his arrival. The most delightful feature in the case is the union that has been brought about among a nation so long famed for dissension. And we cannot help thinking that the scene which Ireland has just exhibited, may furnish solid information respecting the real grievances of that country, and their real and only practicable cure.

Since the days of the *United Irishmen*, and the Rebellion of 1798, we have been told again and again, that Catholic Emancipation is the only remedy for evils which were too glaring to be denied, and too serious to be overlooked. It is forgotten, that when this notion was first put into the heads of the Irish populace, their proverbial quickness did not enable them to

comprehend its meaning; and in order to persuade them to petition for Reform and Emancipation, they were assured that such measures would lower their rents, and relieve them from the payment of tithes. The argument was irresistible, and has always been urged with success. But many persons, without pretending that Ireland has been well governed, or that no improvement can be brought about in the internal administration of her laws, have doubted whether the boon which has been sought with so much earnestness, would contribute in the slightest degree to her peace. Is not this sentiment strengthened by the rapturous reception of the King? He did not come as an Emancipator, but as a Friend and Protector. He has never said that he will support the repeal of the Protestant laws. He has only promised that Ireland shall obtain the attention to which it is entitled. He has convinced his Irish subjects, that they are considered as an important part of his empire, and that he will systematically study and pursue their interests. And this conduct has been received, and is estimated as it deserves. The common sense of the nation, has got the better of the trash which they had imbibed from factious demagogues, and intriguing priests; and it is felt and acknowledged, that the system adopted by George IV. will suffice to make Ireland happy. Let the United Kingdom be governed as far as possible, upon one and the same plan. Let the intercourse between its ports, be rendered more and more intimate. Let us be taught no longer to look upon a journey to Ireland, as an undertaking nearly as formidable as a journey to Moscow. But let every practicable facility be furnished for an interchange of visits; let the public business be put upon the same footing in Dublin and in London; let

justice be administered with the same solemnity, and the same strictness, upon both sides of the channel; let the patronage vested in the Executive, more especially the Ecclesiastical patronage, be disposed of with equal care, and then there will be a reasonable prospect of unanimity and quiet.

The King's visit is naturally accepted as a pledge that all these things will be done. The rich and the noble are expected to follow his example, and to sacrifice some small portion of their personal ease, for the improvement of a country from which they derive such various advantages.

The capitalist is expected to get over the reluctance which he once felt to venture his property upon Irish ground, and the general result must be, that the sufferings of the peasantry will diminish, and the number and respectability and use-

fulness of the resident gentry will increase. Such an event will be followed by the more undeviating attention of government to the interests and wishes of the nation. In spite of the priest, or the demagogue, public tranquillity will be preserved, and the Irish Catholic will become as loyal and as valuable a subject, as the English Catholic has been and is. Take away all hope and expectation of restoring Popery to its throne, and the bigotry even of the priesthood will cease to be injurious. The gradual progress of civilization and knowledge and wealth will give the principles of Protestantism a free circulation through the land; and we have sufficient confidence in the natural superiority of truth, and the continued protection of the great Governor of the world, to trust that the Church of Ireland will raise its head and flourish.

NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Oxoniensis, H. G. and E. S. shall appear.

J. P., R., *A Christian Remembrancer*, and *A Christian Observer*, have been received and are under consideration.